

Vol. II.

APRIL, 1881.

No. 2

THE  
CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN  
QUARTERLY REVIEW

---

EDITED BY THE  
Theological Faculty of Cumberland University.

---

FIRST SERIES, VOL. XVII.  
SECOND SERIES, VOL. XII.

---

LEBANON, TENN.

## CONTENTS.

I.—MINISTERIAL EDUCATION. PROF. S. T. ANDERSON, D.D., Tehuacana, Texas.....	129
II.—THE SUPERNATURAL. S. H. BUCHANAN, D.D., Little Rock, Ark.....	151
III.—THE POSSIBILITIES OF FAITH. REV. S. L. RUSSELL, Gaylesville, Ala.....	166
IV.—TOBACCO. PROF. J. I. D. HINDS, Ph.D., Lebanon, Tenn.....	175
V.—THE PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE AND THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH. PROF. R. V. FOSTER, Lebanon, Tenn.....	185
VI.—THEOPNEUSTY. REV. C. P. DUVALL, Kansas City, Mo.....	190
VII.—H. M. IRWIN'S CRITICISM ON "MOAIC JURISPRUDENCE." HON. R. C. EWING, Silver City, New Mexico.....	198
VIII.—PROF. JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., ON THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CONFES- SION OF FAITH. PROF. S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Lebanon, Tenn.....	202
IX.—NOTES. — CHRIST'S MIRACLES, SPURIOUS ZEAL, CATECHETICS, REVIVALS. PROF. R. V. FOSTER, Lebanon, Tenn.....	228
X.—THE ELDERSHIP.....	237
XI.—LITERARY NOTICES.....	241

A Manual of Classical Literature—The Religion of Ancient Egypt—The Saviour's Converts A Popular Commentary on the New Testament—Testimony of the Ages—British Thought and Thinkers—The Religions of China—The Chaldean Account of Genesis—Chinese Immigration.







# THE REVIEW.

---

APRIL, 1881.

---

## ART. I.—MINISTERIAL EDUCATION.

MINISTERIAL EDUCATION implies a special education as much as legal or medical. As a legal education is supposed to qualify a lawyer to enter upon his profession, and to be efficient at the bar and in the transaction of business, or a medical education gives like advantages to the physician, so a ministerial education is supposed to give the young minister that kind of professional training which will enable him, in an efficient manner, to act as an ambassador for Christ; filling well all the functions of his office.

The term *ministerial* is preferred to *theological*, because it is broader and embraces many points which are not strictly theological.

It is a self-evident proposition that a man's efficiency in any calling, and especially if it be one of the learned professions, depends largely upon his education, and especially his professional education.

It is true that many who are good and valuable members of the Church, do not think a minister of the gospel ought to have a professional education. They even go so far as to assert that the *gospel ministry* is not a profession, but a *calling*; and hence, it needs no professional education, for his efficiency is of God and not from human learning. This last affirmation may be true of an inspired person, and is true in a qualified sense of every truly pious minister of the gospel. But the minister's efficiency consists not solely in endowments of the *heart*, which come chiefly through the grace of

the Divine Spirit, but also of his *mind*, which must come in accordance with the principles which govern mental endowments. Let him have both of these in due proportion and harmony, and then his psychological endowments are such as will constitute him an efficient minister. But others believe that a young man having a fair English education is, in an educational point, qualified to enter at once upon the duties of his calling, needing no additional education except what he will obtain by experience. Others would have him take an ordinary collegiate course of study, and then he is amply qualified to fill with much ability his office. But is this true? Does the history of the Church justify any such conclusion?

The evangelical power of the Church to bless the world has not in any age been a result of particular efforts, whether spasmodic or otherwise; but it has depended upon a daily consistent and pious walk in all the departments of life, with a character modeled after that of Christ's. This type of character, whenever and wherever it has been exhibited by the followers of Christ, has resulted in a great blessing. These are the characters which now constitute the Church, the most potent and efficient factor for good that has ever existed in the world. This is the radiant light which arose in the Oriental world, and has shed its benign rays on the Western continent and the isles of the ocean. This steady, consistent character is the growth of a mind and heart properly cultivated. This culture must be in the ministry, and from the ministry flow to the laity, and then they unitedly must exercise their Christian culture in society and the world at large. This is that peculiar moral power of the "kingdom" which our Lord likened to leaven which the woman hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was permeated and brought under its influence. This Christian culture requires a highly educated ministry; a ministry properly qualified, in the fullest sense of the term, to *teach*; such a ministry as eschews not only evil, but also ignorance.

Can the Church have such a ministry without professional education? History and experience say, *No*. Hence, if the Church accomplish her work—the permeating of the whole

race of man with the leaven of the gospel—she must be very careful to give her ministers an efficient professional education; an education which disciplines the mind, stores it with useful information drawn from science and literature, and especially classical, embracing in a large degree the Hebrew and Greek languages, then theological and ethical; in short, all that is embraced in the comprehensive term *humanities*. Such a ministry, fully consecrated to the special work of preaching Christ and him crucified, would, in a short time, by the blessing of God, fill the world with the knowledge of the truth as it is in Christ. Then, indeed, would the Sun of Righteousness rise with healing under his wings, and shed his benign rays upon every household.

Ignorance is the mother of superstition, vice, schism, and heresy. True Christian culture is the basis of every benign influence now blessing the world. Hence, that branch of the Christian Church which would live and be a blessing to the world, must educate her membership, and that chiefly through an educated ministry. No Church can live, be efficient, and be a blessing to the world, and draw its inspiration from the "*fathers*," even though they may have been among the brightest evangelical lights which have ever blessed our world. Each generation must be wide awake and do for itself. Pious, zealous "*fathers*" do not beget efficient sons without due culture, both of the mind and heart. The bequest of evangelical "*fathers*" ought to be a pure gospel, a sound theology, and a thorough system of moral and mental training. This latter culture must come from good schools, established and carried on in accordance with the most approved principles. If education be ignored or neglected, efficiency ceases, and in time decay and death must come. The history of the Church is full of facts to substantiate this statement—a profound truth which ought to be thoroughly impressed on the Church. But one illustration must suffice.

History plainly indicates that the restoration of peace after the battle of Waterloo was the commencement of a new era in the politics and religion of Europe. French bayonets under Napoleon opened up the way, unobstructed, for the

infidelity of Voltaire. His followers did not lose the opportunity for the propagation of skepticism. But the blow which laid low the armies of France fell with leaden weight upon French infidelity, and proved to it equally disastrous. As the subjugated countries were restored to nationality, a desire animated the hearts of many, and from these it spread to the masses, to return to the pure faith of their fathers.

Holland, for nineteen years, had been downtrodden, so much so that when peace was made in 1814, she did not possess sufficient religious vitality to take full advantage of that rare opportunity. The people, instead of turning from France to an open Bible and genuine Christian culture, turned to Germany and embraced the rationalism of Semler and Paulus.

A careful consideration of the religious condition of Holland at the time the battle of Waterloo occurred and a few years after, shows that orthodoxy was inactive, that the mysticism of the Mennonites aided rather than arrested the incoming error, that Socinianism gained strength, and that the discipline of the Church was exercised with so much laxity as to leave immorality unrebuked. By the constitution of 1816, Church and State were reunited, and this was largely the means of developing and strengthening the incoming rationalism. These facts, in connection with the Pastoral Declaration of the Synod of Hague in 1816, no longer requiring candidates for the ministry unqualifiedly to subscribe to the ancient confessions; and the fact that the Prince of Orange gave his official recognition of the new Hymn Book, setting aside the singing of the Psalms, and making it obligatory to sing the new hymns, many of which inculcated rationalism—these filled up the cup of the misfortunes of the Dutch, and prepared the hearts of thousands for secession.

There was among the masses a deep under-current of religious feeling, but it was not supported by theological education. The lectures in the universities were modeled after the old school of German supernaturalists. Though the Bible was held to be the supreme authority, and its historical characters were esteemed as true, and though its

communications were maintained as infallible, and though miracles and prophetic and apostolic inspiration were accepted, yet the nature of this authority was neglected; and hence, indifference resulted in reference to the value of the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. There was no scientific defense of the pillars of the true faith, for true theological education did not exist. No one attempted to discuss the true ground of miracles and their inherent accordance with the divine laws. The philosophy of Christianity was totally ignored.

The Church sank down into a deplorable condition as respects vital godliness. But the Divine Spirit moved upon the heart of Bilderdyk, a man of great talent and full of moral heroism. He was one of the best poets Holland has produced. His conceptions were vivid, his style impassioned, his diction was unequalled by any of his predecessors, and his moral character was irreproachable. His learning was profound, especially in the classics, history, and jurisprudence. He was ardent in his hatred of French principles and German rationalism. He believed that if new life were kindled in the Dutch heart it must be by a return to the pure teachings of those who were the instruments of the Reformation—to the doctrine of justification by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Under this man, by the blessing of God, a great revival was begun. Other ministers of much natural ability soon joined him in his labors, such as Da Costa, Dr. Capadose, and Groen Van Prinsterer. The last named probably contributed more than any one else to give the revival a true evangelical turn. Of the revival, he said, "It was neither Calvinistic, nor Lutheran, nor Mennonite, but Christian. It did not raise for its standard the orthodoxy of Dort, but the flag of the Reformation, the Word of God. And though it found the doctrine of salvation admirably expressed in our symbolical books, appreciated a rule of education so conformable to the Holy Scriptures, and opposed the doctrines of the Church and the duty of her ministers to the usurpations of Rationalism, it never thought of accepting and imposing the absurd and literal yoke of formularies with an absurd and puerile



anxiety. A spirit of Christian fraternity predominated over the old desires."

The revival inaugurated by Bilderdyk and his associates led to an important secession from the Church of Holland. De Cock and Scholte were the first to lead off in this schism. They were soon joined by such men as Brummelkamp, Van Rech, and Van Velsen; but De Cock was the acknowledged leader. He was a zealous minister, handling the truth with boldness. Many were attracted and people would go from a distance to hear him. Our historian says, "People came from a distance of eighteen miles to hear his sermons." But the Separatists were not permitted peacefully to go out from the State Church and organize a Church of their own. They were prosecuted in 1835 by the Government at the request of the Synod, using an article in the *Napoleon Code*, which forbade the assembly of more than twenty persons for worship without the consent of the civil authorities. They were assailed by mobs and were stigmatized as *New Lights*.

The schism was not a success, though at one time they numbered eighty thousand. Why did they fail? History says their preaching was evangelical. Their theology was formulated from the Bible. Then why did they fail? I will let Dr. Hurst answer. He says, "What promised to be a great and honorable Church, like the Free Church of Scotland, . . . carried with it much of the prejudice and bigotry of the land. *It did not identify itself with scientific progress, and paid little regard to education.* Any man of piety and utterance could become a preacher in one of its pulpits. . . . The young men of talent who now grow up in its fold, stand ready at any moment to unite with some new movement which will combine the piety of their fathers and the scientific demands of the present day."\* This Church has dwindled till its influence for good in Holland is almost extinct. Its numbers are small, and doubtless it will soon be numbered with the things which *were*, but *are not*.

The reference of Dr. Hurst to the Free Church of Scot-

---

\* Hurst's History of Rationalism, chap. xv.

land excites in the mind a desire to contrast its polity with that of the Separatists of Holland.

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND is the name assumed by those who withdrew from the Established Church at the "Disruption in 1843. The schism was not doctrinal, but it had reference solely to the trammels and interventions of Parliament in church matters. The Free Church holds that the control of the civil power pertains to civil government, and that all ecclesiastical matters pertain to the Church, and that her office-bearers and courts derive their authority from Christ. Without going into the details of the controversy, it must suffice to state that the Free Church was organized in 1843, is evangelical, and her creed is the Westminster Confession of Faith. Her first care after perfecting an organization, was an "education scheme," establishing three "colleges for the training of ministers," one at Edinburgh, one at Glasgow, and one at Aberdeen. The term *college for training ministers*, as used in Europe, embraces a course of study in theology.

I have no statistics of this Church of later date than 1873. At that time she had 905 ministerial charges, with numerous "preaching stations," at which preaching was regularly maintained and other ordinances were regularly administered under the care of the Presbyteries. The whole sum contributed for religious and educational purposes was £10,299,386, that is, \$49,437,052.80. This Church has given special care to the education of her ministers and her foreign missions. Her mission stations in various parts of the world are numerous and her missionaries are well sustained.

Why did the Separatists of Holland fail and the Free Church of Scotland succeed? Why has the one ceased to exercise any great influence even at home, while the other's influence for good is not only potent in Scotland but in every quarter of the globe? The answer cannot be that the one was more evangelical than the other, and, therefore, the blessing of God did not rest more signally upon it than the other, but in the fact that one consecrated her money to the cause of ministerial education and missions. Her ministers, from Dr. Chalmers down to the present day, have been



characterized as a body of well-educated men, devoted to the spread of the gospel and the building up of the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

The intelligent reader must necessarily contrast the religious condition of the United States at the close of the eighteenth century with that of Holland during the first and second decades of the present century. A revival of great power began near the close of the last century, which extended into the present—a revival resulting from evangelical preaching arousing a formal Church and awakening sinners to a sense of their true condition. A schism arose, growing out of this revival, which led to the organization of a new Church. This new Church adopted a policy of her own, neither that of the Separatists of Holland, ignoring an *educated ministry*, nor that of the Free Church of Scotland, making it her first duty to establish on a firm basis liberally-endowed colleges, with a theological seminary, for the education of her ministry. An educational clause was inserted in her Confession of Faith, which to the mind of the writer is scriptural, but since the “fathers” of this new Church did not liberally endow a college or a theological seminary, and require the young men coming into the ministry, in so far as they could, to attend these schools, the Presbyteries became careless relative to the mental training of their candidates for the ministry, and many have from time to time been brought into the ministry who were below the standard of the educational clause. These men have failed to make efficient pastors, not training their congregations to systematic benevolence, and to sympathize and work in harmony with the recommendations of the Church judicatories, and have not commanded that respect from the world and other Churches which is due to gospel ministers. Her ministers feeling their inefficiency growing out of a want of proper mental and theological training, avoided the great centers of wealth and influence—the large towns and cities. This has greatly crippled this new Church in all her enterprises requiring money. Country congregations do not have the money which is necessary to carry on vigorously such enterprises

as collegiate education, foreign missions, church extension, and publication.

Again, no Church can be efficient and be a power for good unless it has efficient pastors—pastors who sympathize with the Church in her enterprises and work harmoniously with her higher judicatories. The true pastor not only systematically visits his flock, bringing himself into sympathy by personal contact with each member of his church, but he also teaches them a high degree of benevolence, and responds to all the calls made by the judicatories of his Church, thus saving much precious time and the expense of agents sent out to raise money to carry on said enterprises. This failure on the part of pastors arises from a want of proper *ministerial* education; that part of it which pertains specially to pastoral theology and church polity. These ideas must be made a part of the pastor's thinking and life while he is young and his mind is vigorous, by listening to often-repeated lectures on these subjects by a competent instructor.

Suppose this new Church had made her first care to endow a college and a theological seminary for the education of her ministry, made it obligatory on the Presbyteries to educate their candidates at these seats of learning, except in some instances where circumstances positively forbid, had trained men to become efficient pastors, had at an early period sent some of her best men to occupy the towns and cities, and had early, as did the Free Church of Scotland, sent missionaries into the foreign field, what would be her influence and standing to-day? They would be grand and glorious compared with what they are. Her membership would be fivefold what it is, and her power for good would be noble and praiseworthy. Efficient pastors is the great need of this new Church. This she cannot have till she has her colleges and theological seminary properly endowed, and creates a sentiment such that her candidates for the ministry will not be contented to preach the gospel till they have enjoyed the advantages of these institutions.

The reader must not infer that the writer ignores the fact that said Church has had efficient pastors and learned ministers. She now has many ministers who received their

theological training in the seminaries of other denominations and in her own. But this does not apply to the majority. There ought not to be any inefficient pastors. All ought to be consistent, thorough-working men, leaders in every good and praiseworthy work.

The policy of the Free Church of Scotland was wise, and God has blessed it. The educational policy of the Evangelical Union of Scotland is wise, and has given that young Church a wonderful influence. Many of her ministers have received calls from churches of other denominations to become their pastors. Their scholarship commands the respect of other Churches and of the world. And history clearly shows that God ever blesses wise counsels and true executive ability. These subjects demand profound thought from all the leading men in the Church.

Having shown that the Church must educate her membership, and especially her ministers, the next important question is, What shall be the character of ministerial education? To reply in general terms to this, the united experience of the various denominations of Christians shows that it ought to be specific, varied, and thorough. As it is wise to listen to the voice of experience, I will enter somewhat minutely into what the various Churches regard as proper for the young minister to study as preparatory to his life-work.

For the facts relative to the courses of study prescribed by the various Presbyterian Churches, I am indebted to a writer in the *Catholic Presbyterian*, who had addressed a circular-letter on the subject of ministerial education to the English, Scotch, Irish, American, Continental, and Colonial Churches.

1. *Preparatory Education*.—By all the above-named Churches a regular collegiate education is regarded as essential, except in quite peculiar individual cases. In the Scotch Churches a four years' course in the arts is the ordinary preliminary, and even this course of study does not exempt the theological entrant from an examination on the various branches studied, unless he can present a diploma of the degree A.M., or certificates testifying to his proficiency in certain of the requisites for such a diploma. These latter thus procure a partial exemption; but in any case they must

pass an examination in Hebrew and biblical knowledge before they can be enrolled as regular theological students. In England and Ireland, in Geneva and some other Continental Churches, a three years' collegiate course will pass the student. In France the degree of A.B. is required, and in most of the Continental Churches this degree is held to supersede the necessity for further preliminary examination. In America the student must produce a certificate of having passed through a regular academic course, or a diploma of the degree of A.B., or submit himself to an examination in the branches usually taught in such a course. No Hebrew is required from beginners, though some seminaries recommend that its rudiments be acquired before entering. In Germany the student has to undergo a searching examination on the subjects taught in the gymnasium.\* These subjects in all students, include church history and ethics, being a part of an ordinary liberal education; and in the case of theological aspirants the examination includes Hebrew, they having studied it for several sessions at the gymnasium. From these statements it is evident that the Presbyterian Churches in these various countries require the preparatory education to be classical, literary, scientific, and philosophic. Other Protestant Churches in America require very near the same preliminary course of study.

2. *The Term of Theological Study* in most of the Churches is three years. Such is the time required in the Established and United Presbyterian Churches of Scotland. The Free Church adds a fourth term, each beginning with November and ending with March. The same time is required by the Presbyterian Churches of England, Ireland, America, and most of the Churches in Europe. In the American seminaries the term is eight months, being divided into two sessions by the holidays. In the English Churches the term is seven months. In France four years of study are required, but the first is devoted chiefly to the ancient languages, history, and philosophy. In Germany the period of theo-

---

\* In Germany the gymnasium is a school intermediate between the common schools and the universities, for the higher branches of literature and science, in many particulars corresponding to American colleges.

logical study varies. In some parts it is three and in others it is four years. Students of theology frequently change their universities for the purpose of studying under chosen professors.

3. *The Order of Study* is usually as follows: First, exegetical subjects; then, systematical and historical; and lastly, practical and systematical theology.

Take, as a specimen of the *Scotch* theological curriculum, that of New College, Edinburgh:

FIRST YEAR'S STUDENTS.—Junior Hebrew, Natural Science, Apologetic Theology, Evangelistic Theology, Elocution.

SECOND YEAR'S STUDENTS.—Junior Exegesis—New Testament, Junior Systematic Theology, Senior Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Elocution.

THIRD YEAR'S STUDENTS.—Junior Church History, Senior Exegesis—New Testament, Senior Systematic Theology, Elocution.

FOURTH YEAR'S STUDENTS.—Ecclesiastical and Pastoral Theology, Church History, Evangelistic Theology, Elocution.

All these classes meet daily, except the evangelistic theology and the elocution classes. These meet two hours and one hour per week respectively.

As a specimen of the *American* theological curriculum, take that of Union Theological Seminary, New York City:

JUNIOR YEAR.—*Biblical*.—Hebrew, Pentateuch; Greek, Four Gospels. *Theological*.—Mental and Moral Science, Natural Theology, Evidences, Inspiration and Canon of Scripture. *Homiletical*.—Rhetoric and Elocution. *Historical*.—History of Old Testament, Theological Encyclopedia.

MIDDLE YEAR.—*Theological*.—Doctrinal Course. *Biblical*.—Hebrew, Ecclesiastes and Minor Prophets; Greek, Epistles of the New Testament. *Homiletical*.—Plans of Sermons, Church Government. *Historical*.—The Church in Apostolic Times.

SENIOR YEAR.—*Homiletical*.—Composition and Delivery of Sermons. *Pastoral Theology*.—Lectures. *Historical*.—Church History, History of Doctrines. *Biblical*.—Hebrew, Isaiah, Job; Greek, Epistles of New Testament. *Theological*.—Conclusion of Doctrinal Course.



Throughout the course the students write essays on important topics, have public declamation and public debate once a week.

Much stress is laid upon the exegetical study of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. In connection with these studies lectures are delivered on sacred geography and antiquities. Minute attention is given to pastoral care, church government, and discipline. Provision is made for a post-graduate course for those who wish to spend a fourth year in study.

The course of study in Drew Theological Seminary requires for its completion three years, and is arranged with reference to the attainments of college graduates.

**JUNIOR YEAR.**—*Exegetical Theology.*—Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, Lectures on Hebrew Archæology, Biblical Chronology, Biblical Geography, Biblical Introduction. *Historical Theology.*—Old and New Testament History. *Systematic Theology.*—Sources of Theology, God, Apologetics. *Practical Theology.*

**MIDDLE YEAR.**—*Exegetical Theology.*—Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, Canons of Old and New Testament, Sacred Criticism. *Historical Theology.*—Historical Theology, Classical and Mediæval Church History. *Systematic Theology.*—Anthropology, Christology. *Practical Theology.*

**SENIOR YEAR.**—*Exegetical Theology.*—Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, Inspiration, Interpretation. *Historical Theology.*—Church History—Post Reformation Period. *Systematic Theology.*—Soteriology, Eschatology. *Practical Theology.*

Special attention is given to *practical theology*. This embraces every thing that is designed to make efficient preachers and practical pastors. One professor devotes his whole time to this department.

In *Ireland* the first session is devoted to Christian ethics, church history, and Hebrew, which has already been studied one year. The second is devoted to church history, theology, and sacred criticism. The third, to theology, church history, and sacred rhetoric.

The English Presbyterian and Canadian resemble the Scotch.

In *Germany* much room is given to individual choice, no

course being rigidly defined. The general outline is church history, exegesis, philosophy, biblical theology, dogmatics, ethics, history of dogmas, symbolics, introduction, homiletics, catechetics, pastoral theology, liturgics, and church constitutions.

In *Holland* the government course, in connection with Christian ethics, includes what is called the literature of the Israelites and the literature of the early Christian Church. The curriculum of the Reformed Church embraces the study of its own church history, a course of ecclesiastical law, and the history of Christian missions. In other respects the course of study is very much the same as in Germany.

In *Neuchâtel*, in addition to the ordinary course of study, special attention is given to biblical archæology and what is called pastoral hygiene, individual, social, and moral. One pleasing feature, but possible only when the number of students is small, is the theological soir  e held every two weeks alternately at the residences of the professors, when a paper is read by one of the students on a theme, which is then open for discussion. The Independent Church, and the same is true of the Continental Presbyterian Churches generally, bestows special care on practical theology, which is called in Berne, pedagogy and pastoral prudence. This is studied under three heads, catechetical, homiletical, and pastoral. This in some American seminaries does not receive the attention which its importance demands.

In *Geneva* symbolic arch  ology is added to the ordinary branches. Apologetics comes early in the course and homiletics near the end.

It is regarded as an important provision in most of the seminaries that a student may take one or more sessions abroad, should he find this desirable and convenient. The interchange of Christian sentiment thus obtained tends to the happiest results, both on the individuals and the Churches to which they belong. This privilege was highly valued in the early days of the Reformed Churches, and it is pleasing to know that of late years frequent advantage has been taken of the privilege.

So far as I can ascertain, the curriculum in the theological



seminaries of other orthodox Churches does not differ essentially from that of the Presbyterian Churches. The course on church polity in each is adapted to the peculiar views of its respective denomination in regard to church government and the best mode of training its membership to a proper Christian culture. The Methodist Episcopal Church has a method peculiarly its own, though partially practised by Cumberland Presbyterians in their early history, for those who do not avail themselves of the advantages of the seminary. They are placed on what is technically called a *circuit*. Almost daily the young man addresses an audience. A four years' course of study is also assigned him. At each annual conference he must pass a searching examination on the studies of that year. If he has not mastered them, he must devote another year to the same studies. This method is eminently practical, and the diligent young man, though not a scholar in the ordinary acceptance of the term, may become an excellent preacher, a fair divine, and a good pastor. Some of the brightest men in the Methodist Episcopal ministry received all their theological training in this manner.

Let a young man, after having completed his collegiate and seminary courses of study, spend two or three years on a circuit, daily addressing different audiences, holding protracted meetings three or four months during the year, and it will make him a more efficient extempore speaker and zealous preacher than by any process as yet tried by the Church.

4. Certain *prescribed discourses* have to be prepared by all the students, in all the above-named Churches during their theological course. These prescribed discourses are independent of the class essays, and are used as tests of the young man's ability and fitness for the office of the ministry. In Scotland they are usually six and in the English Presbyterian Church five; viz., a homily, a controversial thesis in Latin or English, a critical exercise in Hebrew, an exercise of like character on a passage in the Greek New Testament, a lecture, and a popular sermon.

In Ireland the students, in addition to class essays, deliver

a sermon to the professor of pastoral theology, an exercise to the professor of sacred criticism, and two discourses each session to the professor of theology.

In America, in most of the seminaries, each member of the junior and middle classes delivers a discourse in the presence of a professor and his class. A longer discourse is read by the members of the middle class. Those of the senior class have to conduct a regular service in the seminary chapel, including a sermon delivered without notes, and is subject to criticism next day in the class. Prior to graduation each student has to submit to the professor of homiletics two lectures and four sermons. In this there is not uniformity in the seminaries of the different denominations.

In France and Switzerland dissertations are similarly prescribed, and in some cases a prize is awarded to the best effort. In Canton de Vaud each student must deliver five sermons on texts prescribed by the professor of practical theology, two catechetical exercises, two expositions in the form of practical exegesis, and two analytical exercises, all of which are suitably distributed over the course. In Geneva six sermons and two catechetical exercises are required before a jury of professors and students, and one dissertation in French, also recitations, analyses, and minor homiletic exercises.

In Germany there are "practical seminaries," where the students have to preach and catechise, and to prepare sermons in full and in outline. But such exercises are not always obligatory.

5. Certain *examinations* must in all cases be passed before the student becomes a licensed preacher, or "probationer," as he is called in Scotland. In the Scottish Free Church the student, in addition to class examinations, is examined annually by his Presbytery. At the close of his curriculum he must pass a searching examination on ten subjects prescribed by an examination board, which is appointed annually by the Assembly from among the best scholars in the Church. The Presbyterian Churches of England, Ireland, America, and the Established and United Presbyterian Churches of Scotland make similar provision for testing the

scholastic proficiency of their candidates for licensure, but in some cases, especially in America, the annual examination is dispensed with, and the student is held directly amenable to the college board or the examining committee of his Church. This largely results from the candidate remaining under the care of his Presbytery at his home, and not being under the care of the Presbytery in the bounds of which the seminary is located. The tendency now is for the examining board to apply the tests for scholarship at the close of the course, leaving the Presbyteries to deal with the character, motives, homiletic gifts, and soundness in the faith of the candidate.

In the Scottish universities there are examinations for the degree of B.D., but they are not essential for licensure.

In France each student must pass an examination at the close of each session, and at the end of the third year the examination for the degree of B.D. Having received this degree and having been "consecrated," he is eligible for a charge. For this degree he must submit six written compositions on prescribed subjects, and pass an oral examination on them. Also a thesis must be publicly delivered on a subject left to his own choice.

In Geneva there are monthly examinations and a general examination at the close of the course, on passing which and presenting a satisfactory thesis before the jury of examiners, the degree of B.D. is obtained.

At Neuchâtel, if the student does not apply for license after six years of theological study, he is regarded as having relinquished all intention to do so. Applicants must present an account of their studies up to the date of their last annual examination. Then they deliver a thesis before the commission and submit to an oral or written examination on biblical criticism and exegesis, systematic theology, and ecclesiastical history. Some latitude is allowed to the student in choosing from which books of Scripture he will prepare his exegesis. But in addition to all these, he has to deliver certain other exercises, including two trial sermons, each to be prepared, and, if possible, committed to memory in three days, besides the liability to undergo

further examination in order to consecration, if it should be deemed proper.

In the Canton de Vaud, France, and sometimes in America, students have to pass examinations at the close of the sessions. At the close of the curriculum comes the general examination in all the great branches. Having successfully passed in all and handed in the requisite exercises, the candidates for diploma are usually submitted to further examination before members of the education committee and the faculty. Each applicant must preach on a text prescribed six days before, hold a "catechism" on a subject announced twenty-four hours before, give an exposition of a small portion of Scripture selected two hours previously by the professors, and hand in and defend a thesis on a subject chosen by himself.

In Germany no examination is absolutely required during the theological course except for certificates for bursaries. After six or eight sessions the "first theological examination" in all branches is passed before the consistory, a professor, and two deputies. Those who succeed in this receive the *licentia concionandi*, constituting them curates or assistant preachers. One result of the State and Church conflict in Germany has been that a State examination on subjects of general culture has to be undergone by all theological candidates before members of the consistory and of the provincial board of education. After an interval of two years comes the "second theological examination," again in all branches of theology. Special emphasis is laid on the practical departments.

The above brief outline of what is required by the leading orthodox denominations of their candidates for the ministry, indicates that the Church realizes the necessity for a thoroughly educated ministry. The ripe scholarship of thousands, the general culture of the people, and the many phases and new forms in which unbelief and irreligion clothe themselves, demand that those who would be religious teachers should have a superior education. No one can conscientiously go to an ignorant man to receive instruction in the most important matters which ever engaged the

mental powers of intelligent beings. Religious instruction should come not only from a pure heart, but also from a clear and well-disciplined mind, one that can grasp the great truths of Christianity and present them so clearly that a child may understand them. Hence, the Church ought to make heavy demands for close and persevering study on the part of her candidates. Let no one present himself to the Church for holy orders unless he has made up his mind to a life of laborious study and work.

In no age, since the apostolic, has the Church been so thoroughly imbued with the true spirit of foreign missions as the present. The future is to be far more so than the present. To meet this demand on the Church she should make provision to give those who are to be her missionaries thorough metaphysical discipline. Every phase of speculative philosophy, both of ancient and modern times, must be met on heathen ground and fully answered, if Christianity be successfully planted. At the convention of the native Christians of Japan in the summer of 1880, one of the speakers said, "The conflict of Christianity in Japan is not to be with Shintuism or Buddhism, but with European infidelity and atheistic evolutionism. Hence, preachers of the gospel should have a good scientific training to meet the requirements of the hour." What is felt in Japan is experienced as fully in India\* and China, the two lands which embrace nearly half the human family. Hence, *psychology*† in the

---

\*The Rev. Narayan Sheshadri, a native Hindu, in his address before the Inter-Seminary Missionary Convention at New Brunswick, N. J., October 24, 1880, showed that the missionary must study the speculative philosophy of heathen sages in the language in which they wrote. The Hindu philosophy is in the ancient Sanscrit. This language he must study if he would successfully answer the objections urged against Christianity, and point out the fallacies of said philosophy. Hence, those who contemplate becoming missionaries ought, as early as possible, to begin the study of the language of the people among whom they are to spend their lives.

† This word is derived from *psukee* and *logos*. The primary signification of the former is *breath*, as the sign of life. Hence, *life* or *spirit*. Secondly, the *soul*, the *immortal part* of man, as opposed to the body or perishable part. Homer uses the word only in the sense of a *departed soul*, *spirit*, or *ghost*. He represents it as bodiless and not to be seized by mortal hands (Od. ii., 207), but yet keeping the form of him who owned it in life. Thirdly, the abstract notion



true sense of the word ought to be made very prominent in the curriculum of every theological seminary.

The minister's life is not wholly one of benevolence, but is also one of warfare with Satan and satanic influences in a thousand shapes. The weapons of his warfare are not carnal but metaphysical, and must by faith and genuine mental culture be made mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. Nothing is more common than in some form to pervert almost every principle of mental science. One of the most powerful forms of unbelief now prevalent has for its chief premise a perversion of the term reason. Every principle of Christianity is made to bow to human reason. REASON is its watch-word, and hence calls itself *Rationalism*, and nothing must be received as truth unless it can be grasped by *reason*. The minister must not only see the falsity of such a perversion, but must be able to make other men see it, and by some forcible illustration eradicate the error from the mind. He must show the true province of reason and represent Christianity in its true light. If reason and Christianity be represented by right lines, they run parallel as far as reason goes—no antagonism between them; but the line representing Christianity would be infinitely long, while that representing reason would be finite. The former comes from God, the latter from man. The thoughts of God are wrought into Christianity. The thoughts of man are wrought into reason. The thoughts of God descend into depths and ascend into heights into which man's cannot go. Hence it is that the superficial thinker regards our religion as unreasonable. He knows not the bounds of reason, its true origin, and its limits. He understands not God's thoughts, or his mode of presenting them to the conception of finite beings. The *true light* has not shown into his psychological nature. True and lofty Christian culture takes hold of the mind, the soul, and the heart, and

---

of the *soul* or *spirit* of man. Fourthly, it represents the seat of *thumos*, the *will*, *desire*, *passion*. Primarily *logos* signifies *word*, or *outward form by which the inward thought is expressed and made known*, thence, a *saying*, a *statement*. Hence, psychology is the scientific knowledge of the powers and functions of the human soul, so far as they are known by consciousness.

lifts them out of the defilement of ignorance and error. Thus instructed, the mind reasons, but within the just limitations of reason; the soul purified, strives to rise to a higher plane in the thoughts of God, reaching out continuously to be more and more like Christ; and the heart turning from the unlovely, centers its holiest affections in God. Such a person is in sweetest harmony with himself and with God.

No profession requires of him who would stand in its front ranks so much knowledge and on such a variety of subjects as the Christian ministry. But since it is not possible for any one man to master all branches of learning, each minister, in addition to making himself intelligent upon a wide range of topics, ought to select some one branch of learning congenial to his tastes, and make himself a *scholar* in that specific department. Then by a fraternal exchange of pulpits, when some specific branch of learning need be brought prominently before a congregation, the people could have the benefit of a more profound and scientific knowledge than what they possibly could have under the system requiring each minister to supply the demands in every department.

In view of the fact that the minister's teaching is chiefly by public oral discourse, he needs to give special attention to elocution. Not only is it needful that he should know *what* to say, but *how* to say it. Every candidate for the ministry ought to receive special instruction from a competent teacher how to cultivate his vocal organs, so as to make him a good reader and an impressive orator. Too much attention cannot be given to gesticulation in order to make him a polished speaker. All the graces of the highest oratory can be acquired by patient, persevering study and practice, as the history of Demosthenes incontestably proves. This branch of instruction is too much neglected in the majority of colleges and seminaries.

May the time soon come in the history of the Church when the ministry shall receive that Christian culture which their high calling demands—a culture which will qualify them to become efficient pastors, zealous preachers, bold



defenders of the truth, and hearty coöperators in every righteous work. Such culture is physical, mental, spiritual, and psychic,\* rejecting every custom, habit, and appetite which may defile the body, or weaken the mind, or pollute the soul. Let the Christian minister be a gentleman, polished in his manners and address, and an orator using all the powers of his cultivated mind to impart instruction to his hearers, and all the pathos of a new-born soul to persuade men to yield their wills and their hearts to the mild and peaceful rule of our adorable Redeemer, that they may in all things be Christ-like.

S. T. ANDERSON.

---

\* This word is used by recent metaphysicians to describe the human soul in its relation to sense, appetite, and the outer visible world.

## ART. II.—THE SUPERNATURAL.

THE question raised by the word supernatural is, Is the universe self-controlling or is it under direction from without? Let not the word supernatural be confounded with non-natural. The one is legitimate administration over the universe, the other is *il*-legitimate interference. The Christian doctrine of miracles has been falsely stated, both by its friends and foes, as a violation of the laws of nature. The question before us is one not of violence, but of administration. Is there such administration? If so, how far can the administrative power be known, and in what way is it related to the inherent activities of nature?

The difficulties that surround the question of a first cause are escaped by no school of philosophy. We may busy ourselves with the misfortunes of other theories on this question, and hope thereby to dismiss the trouble that haunts us in our own, but that question will not *down* at the bidding of any philosophy. Sooner or later every one must come to the unknown, and happy is that philosophy which acknowledges a boundary beyond which it cannot go.

If the universe gives any evidence of its cause or of the power that controls it, such evidence is legitimate material in the investigation of this question.

To adopt the conclusions of one set of specialists and attempt to arrest the backward search toward a first cause by shutting off the light which comes from other departments of learning and philosophy, is unblushing bigotry and impudence. The student in these matters is allowed to press on all lines of research right up to the unknowable. If the unknowable be reached on one line of research and light appears in another direction, the investigator may turn and seek the boundary here. Truth will never be reached while science ignores philosophy and calls it bad

names, or courts it only that the two may raise the cry of dogmatism against theology. The true boundary line of knowledge on the question of the origin and control of the universe is only reached through the united powers of science, theology, and philosophy. To that boundary the search must go or no satisfaction can be guaranteed to us. Every effect observed must have an adequate cause, known or unknown. To ignore this principle would be to confound the unknown and the unknowable with the absurd.

Do the facts of the universe testify to the working of natural laws only, or do they bear marks of the supernatural?

Chemistry teaches that the elementary substances possess the characteristics of "manufactured material;" that is, they have definite adaptation for certain combinations and actions. Elements always combine in definite proportions, and are endowed with properties which seem to be distinct from the essence of matter itself. Beyond the atom thus endowed, chemistry cannot go. When it, therefore, reaches the limits of the knowable, it stops with its hands full of "manufactured material" from an unknown factory.

Should the border-line of the knowable be extended, and other simple substances be added to the list, or should a number of those in the list be found to be compound, the result in philosophy would be the same, unless indeed it would be additional evidence that the elements are "manufactured material." It would only result in a larger amount of manufactured material, or a smaller amount with extended properties and adaptations. Nothing short of the overthrow of the science of chemistry can remove the evidence that primary substances are "manufactured or adapted material." The essential elements of adaptation in the simple substances of nature are effects which it is absurd to say were uncaused. Chemistry stops not with a self-existent effect which is an absurdity, but with an effect whose cause is unknown, and leaves the question to be taken up jointly with other branches of science. On the question before us, as to whether the sufficiency is originally and permanently from within or from without the universe itself,

the ultimatum of chemistry is an effect—cause unknown and without, but with the inference legitimate that the cause was an originator *per se*, since the elements of adaptation in primary substances are essential and not superinduced. The discovery of that which is like nothing else known, and is uncompounded, necessarily raises the question of origin, and all of its properties go for so much as they are worth in attestation of the character of the originator. Chemistry, then, leaves us with the question of origin and cause of adaptation of material fairly aroused, and declares it *without* its province. This is also its attitude on the question of vital force as displayed in organized bodies. There is something *without* its province in every living organization. The microscope of the physiologist may throw light on this boundary line of knowledge in chemistry.

I have given this as a specimen of the far-reaching results of the essential powers of adaptation of the primary substances of the universe, because it shows that the origination of each one must have relationship to the origination of each other one. Their origin must have been a unity—a *One* without the lines of the universe as defined by chemistry. Chemistry gives us, then, only effects which, in their relationships to each other, indicate a common cause, an *Originator*.

The discoveries of the spectroscope show the force of this reasoning as applicable in the whole of the *known universe*, and gives the inference that the application extends to the unknown.

From all schools of philosophy and every province of science there comes the acknowledgment of a reign of law and order. Harmony and adaptation are denied nowhere. Law with a Law-giver, order with an Ordainer, harmony with a Harmonizer, adaptation with an Adapter, cause no violence to our sense of truth and the right relation of things.

The cause of order is, at least in part, traceable back through properties that lie in the primary substances of the universe, but the *combinations* producing the order, harmony, and adaptation are not essential properties of these sub-

stances any more than being a desk is an essential property of walnut wood. The material has a passive power of being combined, just as the wood has a passive power of being made into a desk.

The evidence of a *supernatural without* was shown in the ultimatum of chemistry. But the fact that material can be withdrawn from the combinations, and that the combinations are progressive in their tendency, and are not essential properties in simple substances, shows that the passive power of being combined in various ways must be supplemented by an active power.

The possible combinations of a certain number of colors includes that combination which makes a portrait, but the portrait was not made without an artist. The possible combinations of these colors are innumerable, and that which makes the portrait is only one of this number, and an artist made it. When would the colors have made it without the artist?

Let us look a little at this problem of permutations. A merchant takes ten letters, each one representing a figure in Arabic numerals, the group in which he adjusts them to the figures is only one group in over three millions of others possible.

Take the group of English letters, twenty-six in number. The alphabetic order is only one in over four hundred and three septillions of orders in which they can be placed in a row, one after another. The answer of the problem of possible permutations of the letters of the alphabet in groups of twenty-six, so that every letter would be in every group, is reached by the continued product of all the numerals from one up to twenty-six.

Look out upon the stars of heaven. Let the place of each star be known. The possible number of permutations of stars in their given places would be the continued product of all the numbers from one up to the number of all the stars. Multiply this by the possible number of places in limitless space, and the product becomes the possible number of permutations in space.

Break up all combinations of simple substances in all the

worlds, and their possible number of permutations is the continued product of all the numbers from one up to the number of all the atoms of simple substances, multiplied by all the spaces large enough for any one combination, and this modified by the essential properties of simple substances. The number is unthinkably great. The present order of the universe is only one amongst all that unthinkable number. The product, then, of any given combination is one in an infinite number, which, mathematically, is expressed by  $(\frac{1}{\infty}=0)$  one divided by infinity equals zero, an impossibility!

Materialism, on this subject, uses some very poor logic. It reasons thus: Among the combinations possible in the universe the present is one since it exists, therefore, a creator was not needed, as the order of the universe is possible without him. Here the logically possible is confounded with the practically possible. The logically possible, with any number of given things, includes every thing which is not a negation of the given things. The practically possible includes only what the given things, as a cause, can produce. To confound two things so different is certainly misleading, yet it is the metaphysics of those who denounce all other metaphysics as worthless. The conclusion is as far from what is in the premises as the facts of the universe are from  $(\frac{1}{\infty}=0)$  one divided by infinity is equal to zero, which is the mathematical expression of the value of the first or logical possibility.

Add automatic or instinctive power to the mechanical power and there is an approximation made toward an adequate cause for the universe. But automatic or instinctive power is not adequate to explain evolution or progress, because both words are intended to be a denial of the power of progress.

Automatic or instinctive power as an adequate cause must grow out of the equality of involution with evolution or progress. Such involution is not confirmed by chemical analysis or any other method of proof, and if it were, instead of affording proof of a sufficiency within, it would but leave the ultimatum of chemistry with larger effects, which it must refer to an unknown *cause* without its province.



The attributes of primary substances give no evidence of such previous involution to form an equation with evolution. The whole of such involution is purely hypothetical and is denied by chemical analysis. For an adequate cause of the order of the universe something more must be added. Intelligence and skill added to the power of placing the alphabet in groups of twenty-six, will place them in the alphabetic order at the first effort. Add the skill of the artist to the power of the colors, and the portrait becomes possible. Add to the chemical properties of primary substances, beside mechanical and instinctive or automatic power, adequate intelligence, and the order, harmony, and adaptation of the universe is accounted for by an adequate cause.

Materialistic philosophy recognizes a principle of order, harmony, and adaptation. There is no trace of such a principle except in results—effects that are as serviceable and fairly used in support of a *supernatural without*.

A principle of order and harmony is not among those properties that belong to matter. Principle is an attribute usually assigned to mind or persons. Mechanics and chemistry talk of the properties of matter, but they say nothing of its principles. Their attributing the principle of order and harmony to matter is a corollary of the hypothesis that mind is the product of organized matter, and must share the fate of that hypothesis. Many of the attributes of mind are negatives of those of matter. Mental emotion is without measurement in space, color, and inertia. No chemical analysis finds it a something, or even a property of something else. It is just so with thought. Mind has no weight; matter has. Therefore mind has and has not weight, if it is organized matter. Every quality of mind is wanting in matter. Every quality of matter is wanting in mind. Mind cannot, therefore, be "the other side of matter." The principle of order, harmony, and adaptation can be nothing else than the adjustment of things as means to ends. We come within our own consciousness, and by its testimony we know that this wonderful factor of order in the universe is like a power of mind inseparable from intelligence.



This principle of order, harmony, and adaptation, as defined in the universe, is presented as the cause of living organizations and forms. With only a track, a tooth, or a scale given, Cuvier and Agassiz reproduced the forms and skeletons of animals unknown to them. Later discoveries verified their work as true. Here is mind achieving the same results attributed to this wonderful principle of order.

There is an experiment in science by the use of alcohol and water mixed, so that it is of the same weight as a mass of oil put into it, which admirably illustrates the nebular hypothesis, and puts the development of at least one planetary system down before us in a miniature imitation of world-making. The mass of oil become a globe which, by rotation, flattens at the poles, enlarges at the equator, and throws off one ring after another. These rings break with a comet-like nucleus and tail, wind up their tails, become globes and throw off a second group of rings and make little moons out of them. This little mind-work produces the analogue of world-making as defined in the nebular hypothesis. If mind caused the miniature imitation, nothing inferior to mind could produce the great original.

When two effects are analogous a resemblance of causes is certainly indicated. When one of these causes has a group of properties that are the negatives of the properties of matter, the other cannot be a property of matter nor resemble it. The *principle* of order, harmony, and adaptation is not, therefore, a property or part of the material universe.

The similarity of the industry of nature to the industry of art certainly allows us to conclude that since the industry of art is the result of thought or knowledge, the other must be so too. If the similarity here mentioned does not allow me to conclude that the author of the universe was intelligent, then the similarity of my industry to that of my neighbor is no evidence that he plans intelligently. The testimony of consciousness satisfies each of us that we plan, and the truths of consciousness rank as first-class. The method of reaching truth by analytical reasoning must be abandoned if it goes for nothing here. But it never has been and never will be abandoned by men, and all there is

within it of force sustains the idea of intelligent planning over the universe. Behind all of order, harmony, and adaptation there must be the idea of a plan of adjustment of parts. An idea is a combination of thought—thought, the product of a thinker, and a thinker is not within the products or parts of the material universe, as will be shown from physiology.

If the cause of the order of the universe was the result of the chemical properties of matter, then as quartz shoots its crystals, there would be world-making going on every where. It is true that the utility of the materials depends upon their properties, but such use as the crystalization of a planetary system is nowhere found.

The order of the universe cannot be accounted for except by a force supplemental to that which makes primary substances of such a character that Sir John Herschel called them “manufactured material.”

All the great facts of gravity, electricity, light, heat, sound, and order are illustrations of something beside chemical force in the universe, and if so, there has been an addenda of force after the beginning of the existence of matter. The correlation of forces having different names, as light, heat, electricity, etc., speaks plainly of a subsequent addenda to the properties of primary substances. Science holds in half-verified hypothesis the intimation that gravity, sound, odor, and all that there is in magnetism belong in this great correlation of forces.

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; and the earth was unformed and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.” “And God said, Let there be light, and there was light.” This grand correlation of forces bearing one of its names, *light*, is here declared to be an addenda to primary substances. This oldest of written language bears testimony to the scientific idea of an addenda after the existence of primary substances. Here is the origin of mechanical force in the universe, and the great Originator is without the known of the material universe.

There is another great force that is an addenda, viz., vital

force, which sometimes stands associated with intelligence or voluntary force. They are found in relation to organized matter, but in what manner? As music unto the harp? Then they are the results of organization. Or are they as the musician to the harp? There is a record of history of the world older than the history of vital force. It must, therefore, be an addenda. The history of vital force has been traced back behind all structure or organization to a structureless beginning. Life in a structureless little mass has been shown to have the power to weave the whole structure of the living body. It, therefore, as the cause of the organization, cannot be the product of it. It is known only as the product of antecedent life. That antecedent life is the effect of a cause unknown and beyond material science. Vital force is distinct from mental force—vitality and mind both addenda outside of matter, but apart from each other. Vital force bears a relation to the organization somewhat like that of the mechanic who made the harp, to the harp. I cannot define the relation of mind to the body or structure better than it has been done by Prof. Draper, author of "The Conflict between Science and Religion." He says (in his *Physiology*, p. 285), "If the optical apparatus be inert and without value save under the influence of light; if the auditory apparatus yields no result save under the impressions of sound—since there is between these structures and the elementary structure of the cerebrum a perfect analogy—we are entitled to come to the same conclusion in this instance as in those, and asserting the absolute inertness of the cerebral structure in itself to impute the phenomena it displays to an agent as perfectly external to the body, and as independent of it, as light and sound; and that agent is the soul." Again (p. 286), he says, "We have established the existence of the intellectual principle as external to the body."

Mind is, therefore, to the body as the musician to the harp. Add to these quotations the import of the article on *Biology*, in the ninth edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, from Prof. Huxley, and also the results of experiments upon rabbits, frogs, and other animals, and we may conclude from

them (1) that *life* antedates the structure as its cause; (2) that *mind* or soul is external to the body and not the product of it, since its model is an antecedent mind included in the idea of the race or species, and is the conservator of bodily life. Life and mind, therefore, are facts which are traced back to an origin unknown within the material universe. They have a beginning on earth and must, therefore, have had an origin. An origin, therefore, without matter is clearly indicated, and we may place them in the list of addenda to the universe from without.

In the foregoing discussion we have followed each effect back through the line of causation until an effect was reached, with a cause unknown within the material universe. The things so traced back are the primary substances with their properties, the mechanical forces of the universe, known as light, heat, gravity, etc., vital force and intelligent, voluntary force.

We must adhere to the great truth: every effect must have an adequate cause. These things are effects and must have had a cause. This cause has been shown to be without the material universe. The whole force of the arguments that are used in showing that this cause is unknowable, is expended in showing that it is without the province of material science, because the authors of the idea that this cause is unknowable express a refusal to go outside of the province of material science in their search. They, therefore, arbitrarily put a limit to knowledge. With a group of facts as effects, they first refuse the testimony of the nature of these effects as to their cause, and ultimately deny the power or fact of such a cause.

There is no reason why this cause should not be judged by its effects as other causes are. The facts point to an originator—a creator. The only thing known to us as having the power to originate is mind. All the progress of knowledge is traced by the effects of intellectual creations of realizable ideas. We do know of this power, both from facts as its effects and from consciousness, both of which stand as adequate evidence. The creative powers of mind, therefore, are analogous to one feature of this *cause*. The

similarity of the industry of art, man's work, to the industry of nature has been sufficiently insisted upon. It shows that mind in adjusting means to ends, bears an analogy to the ordainer and planner of the universe. Knowledge of mind by its effects is legitimate and certain. For this order and harmony we can find no adequate cause beside a supernatural mind. The idea of creative genius and administrative ability is clearly defined in the outline which the groupe of effects called the universe gives to their cause. While astronomy clearly shows that mechanical force plays an important part in the order of the universe, it shows also that such force is incorporated in a plan. Meteorology is the science which considers the condition of the atmosphere, state of the weather, etc. If its phenomena were purely mechanical the measure of rainfall, the mass and drift of clouds, and the measure of sunheat could be exactly expressed in mathematics, just as eclipses of sun and moon are. The reports of the weather bureau, however, show that atmospheric phenomena are not reducable to mathematical calculation, and he who conjectures is baffled, just as the spinner baffles the mathematics of the machinist, and leaves him only to approximate the number of daily revolutions of the spindles which he runs. The predictions of weather-prophets are as uncertain as Buckle's statistics from human life. This bureau, therefore, shows that the great power of the universe is under the control of a power adjusting it to the elements and wants of voluntary action. Furthermore, the will has a certain control over material things. At will the snail slimes his pathway *up* the rock and the grasshopper hurls back the force of gravity and bounds away from your footfall. The measure of the horse's power has become the standard of reference in mechanics, Man has such a power of manipulating matter, his boundary-line is moving forward by constant achievement. Such power lying along the pathway of voluntary action would seem to require that a power of the same sort be found in the administration of the universe. The facts of progress and the weather probabilities show that over the universe there is such a free, voluntary administration.



The relation of the supernatural to the natural, of a supreme mind to a subordinate mind, is a question that cannot reasonably be set aside by either the subordinate or the supernatural mind. We must have contributions to this science from both minds. Therefore a revelation is needed. All religion must be investigated from this stand-point. A science of religion, as the science of the supernatural, is forced upon us by correct thinking, and can be escaped only by ignoring or denying a cause for evident effects.

If human mind can manipulate the little universe around it, certainly its great analogue has equal power. Voluntary action is beneath a reign of law. So says consciousness. Adequate administration over it cannot be without such power of action. The facts of the universe allow such action under law. The order and harmony of the universe would be destroyed if there was no such power in the supernatural.

Thus far we have grouped together the effects that find a cause outside of the material universe, and upon them formed the conception which they give of a cause. If this cause were physical, mathematics would show its presence and necessity, as in the case of other physical causes. But it eludes mathematics just as mind does. Physical science will not reach it. It need not absurdly deny it because it is rich in effects which find no other solution. The supernatural is known as the conception of an adequate cause for known effects. It is the unity of the grouping of all outlines of first cause from the facts of the universe. There is no trace of effects from causes beyond, because we pass behind all known effects in forming the conception of this cause. The line of the knowable is not arbitrarily drawn here. Of necessity it falls here. Here it may remain and allow freedom to all science. Anything short of this will cause a cry of agnosticism hurtful to all science by making enemies of those who are friends. Every science is peaceful under this adequate cause behind all effects.

At the outset the opinion was advanced that all systems of philosophy and science must sooner or later come to the unknowable. This is as true in theology as elsewhere. In



the foregoing pages two principles have been carefully observed.

1. Every effect must have a cause.

2. Every effect is a fair and reliable witness as to the character of its cause. The effect may not wholly declare its cause, but whether it wholly declares its cause, or whether only in part, it is entitled to be heard and investigated. We have seen that the matter of the universe does not bear marks of independent, self-existence. Each primary substance bears relations to other primary substances, and is unable to produce either itself or those related to it. If the one made itself, then it made the other substances, because their mutual relations must and can be explained only by the idea of a *oneness* in their cause. Not one primary substance reproduces itself or kind, as animals and vegetables do. If they did, then materialism would have a beginning-place in the eternal generation of primary substances. It could have such a beginning, too, if vital and mental force had no record in nature of a beginning. But there is a record in history for the universe older than vital force or mental force, as related to material structures. The beginnings of these in the animals of geology are clearly known, and are known nowhere as the product of primary substances without antecedent life or antecedent mind. In brief, nature knows no cause within itself for primary substances for life except antecedent life—for mind except antecedent mind conjoined with vital force.

We see plainly the production of vegetable life and animal life, and also mind, by antecedents like themselves. They are, therefore, shown to be effects produced and not self-existent entities. The antecedent mind and life are shown to have a beginning in nature, and being effects, they must have had a cause. Nature cannot show one solitary claim to such power of causation as to produce life and mind independent of antecedent life and mind. For this cause we must pass out of nature to a supernatural one, just as we do for a cause of primary substances, and as shown above, for the mechanical force of the order and arrangement of the whole universe.

Then, as a student of natural theology, I come to the boundary-line of the knowable in this search when I have found a conception of the cause of all these effects that carries no absurdity within itself. It may have mysteries, unknown things in it, but I am not on that account to repudiate what may be known because I cannot know all. To do so would be as consummate folly as to stop breathing because my lungs cannot contain all the atmosphere that surrounds the world. A living, active, powerful, supernatural mind holds within itself all the elements of the kind of a cause which the facts of the universe, as effects, indicate as their cause.

Paley's watch may become the plaything of the wits of a stultified philosophy, but they cannot so play with the elements that go to make up this organized universe, without the risk of showing that in philosophy they are playing the fool. The question may be gravely asked, Who made your Supernatural One? and may be as gravely answered, I do not know. Who made your world, if God did not? can have no answer but the confession of ignorance; but we are not at rest in the declaration of ignorance of the author of the world, because the world shows that it *was made*, and that it did not make itself, and, therefore, has a right to make its showing as to who did make it. To deny this liberty as a fundamental principle in philosophy brands the philosophy as short-lived, because men have never long carried such bondage. If they carry it, they die of imbecility under the burden of a senseless dogmatism.

Should we attempt to reason further to find this first cause, the *Supernatural One*, facts are all wanting. If there be such facts they come not within our ken, and we must stop with the declaration of *unknown*.

Should we, thus driven from the question from want of facts, attempt other methods of reasoning, just so far they will serve us. We know, at least in part, of the origin of mind, which is claimed to be the analogue of the great Supernatural One. Its origin is dependent upon antecedent paternal minds like unto itself. It is the product of its kind. The analytical process, then, could do nothing more

than place in the mouth of the great supernatural *One* the words of Jesus of Nazareth, "I and my Father are one." Nothing of practical value, therefore, as to the character of this great cause can be reached by such reasoning beyond this, viz., that the teaching of philosophy shows that here is the resting-place of philosophy and science.

Just three conceptions of the cause of the universe are possible. 1. A blind, all-powerful physical force—a world of chance. 2. A universe that is a great automaton, full of instinctive, anti-progressive force—a world of pantheism. 3. A world of law, order, and intelligent progress toward something grander—a world of the living God; not of anthropomorphism, which is only a bad name for facts that cannot be dismissed. The whole group of the facts of the universe are in harmony only with the last, while only a partial view of the universe sustains the other two. The things embraced in these partial views are not inconsistent with the last, which is the only one that is the outcome of a free study of the whole case. Of the three conceptions of the cause of the universe, the last is the more noble and best adapted to be a great factor of human worth and growth; because, in the first the cry of the soul would be for deliverance; in the second, it would be for something better and more progressive; in the third, "Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen."

S. H. BUCHANAN.

## ART. III.—THE POSSIBILITIES OF FAITH.

OURS is an age of prodigious activities. There are great revolutions going on. Old methods are being dispensed with; new ones are being introduced in their stead. This is true in every thing and every where. It is preëminently true in matters of religion.

We have not only new plans of work, but new methods of thought as well. This is as it should be. If the Bible cannot stand the test of the advanced thought of this or any other age, let it pass into deserved oblivion and give place to something better—something which can stand the test of the crucible. We are glad to note this mental and religious intensity. It augurs well for the future.

Let the world *think*. Let it think profoundly. Especially when it comes to think of God and eternity, let it be sober and intelligent. Let no one come to the altars of God impelled by a blind superstition. Let no one enter the portals of Zion without an abiding and intelligent assurance as to whither he is going. Let Zion's watchmen challenge the world to examine seriously, severely. Let them call aloud from her watch-towers, "Walk about Zion, and go round about her; tell the towers thereof. Mark ye well her bulwarks, consider her palaces; that ye may tell it to the generation following."—Psa. XLVIII. 12, 13.

The most listless reader will not fail to observe that faith is the predominant feature of revealed religion. It is the condition upon which life and salvation are tendered to a guilty world. Whatever other graces of the Spirit a man may have, without faith he cannot secure the favor of God, for without faith it is impossible to please him. (Heb. xi. 6.) And just here, if we read correctly, is the sharp point of contact to-day between revealed religion and natural science. Science demands that every proposition, whether physical,

intellectual, moral, or religious, shall be established by facts. It holds that whatever is not demonstrable by facts is to be rejected as false; or, at best, to be regarded as visionary. Religious teachers have, I think, yielded too much to this unreasonable demand. An eminent Scotch teacher recently said, "It is the distinct task of philosophy and science to attack every hypothesis with the demand for evidence. Temporary place and influence may be allowed to a plausible conjecture, but in due time it must vindicate its claims to respect or disappear. Opinion may float for a season in the atmosphere undefined in form, but ere long it must be formulated and give substantial proof of its certainty, or it must, like a cloud, be dissipated in thin air. As Plato has insisted opinion has no certainty, it may as well be false as true, and nothing short of certain knowledge can satisfy or hold permanent sway over the mind." But is science true to itself in making such lofty demands? Is it true that nothing short of "certain knowledge can satisfy or hold permanent sway over the mind?" We may not understand the question, but if we do, this is putting it entirely too strong. How much of the stock of knowledge which the scientist himself has in store did he receive on trust? We speak very confidently of what we know, but when we come to speak with scientific accuracy, a very small per cent. of what we claim to know is the philosopher's certain knowledge. When we come to think of it right carefully, there is scarcely any thing we do know which we have learned by the fact-process. We say we know there is germinating power in a grain of corn. We say we know this because if we subject it to heat and moisture it will germinate and grow. But is our knowledge here the product of facts or of faith? Are we scientifically certain? Is there not a possibility that the power of germination was in the warmth or in the moisture, or that it was transmitted by some external agent using these as its media? I leave the thoughtful to answer these questions. Indeed a very small percentum of human transactions is predicated upon certain knowledge, but upon the much-ridiculed faith of the Christian. It was not knowledge but



faith which inspired and guided Columbus westward to the East. It was not the scientist's boasted knowledge which laid the Atlantic cable and tied two world's together. It was *faith*.

We have heard this point further illustrated in this way: A man has in his hands a large sum of money. He does not wish to keep it about his person or in his house. He seeks a place of greater security. He takes it to a bank and deposits it in the iron safe or the more ponderous vault. Now it is safe. He can sleep soundly now. But what would all the bolts and bars and mysterious combinations amount to if the key is in the hands of a rogue who understands and directs all these combinations? So, after all, it is the man's faith in him who carries the key which gives him his quiet.

If, then, faith is so essential in all the affairs of life, it does seem we might be allowed its exercise in matters of religion without the charge of weakness or the laugh of scorn. I do not complain of too many facts, of too much logic, but of too little faith. And I object, too, to arraying faith and reason in opposition to each other as if they were of necessity antagonistic. Faith without reason leads to blind superstition, while reason without faith leads to equally blind atheism.

As I have said above, I believe we have already yielded too much to the pretentious demands of over-wise scientific teachers. The affections cannot be fed and nourished with logic. Our moral nature has cravings and immortal longings which nothing short of faith, the faith of the gospel, can satisfy. Why should we undertake to stifle these longings because we cannot subject them to the rules prescribed by scientists?

Whence come these cravings for immortality? Are they not the inherent out-goings and up-risings of our nature? If so, is there not the same propriety in gratifying these that there is in satisfying the mind with its appropriate aliments or the body with suitable nourishment? Faith is soul food. On one occasion a man brought his son which had a dumb spirit to Jesus. Jesus was absent and the father submitted

the case to the disciples and they could not cast it out. When Jesus returned the man stated the case to him, and said, "But if thou canst do anything have compassion on us and help us." Jesus said unto him, "If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth." It will be noted that the father asked the cure for his son. The reply of the Saviour, while it was calculated to excite the hope of the father, does not intimate that there is any power to be delegated to him to cure his son, but that the cure of the son hinged upon his faith. There is no strength in the father nor virtue in his faith. His faith only renders it possible for the Saviour to perform the cure—one of the grand possibilities of faith. But we may inquire more particularly what the father was required to believe. He was not put on the test as to his orthodoxy generally. There was a sharp point at issue. His son was fearfully afflicted. With a father's love and a father's anxiety he sought relief. He tried the disciples. They failed. Discouraged and doubting, he appealed to Jesus, "If thou canst do anything, help us." The quick response comes, full of comfort yet full of responsibility. Help is at hand; your wish can be gratified, your anxiety relieved, your son can be cured if you can just believe. Believe what? Believe simply that Jesus can cure his son. With mingled joy and grief, he cries out with tears, Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief.

But we may inquire, How could the man believe? His faith cannot be predicated upon the philosopher's "certain knowledge." The *facts* are not in his possession, nor can they, from the very nature of the case, be adduced to prove that Jesus can heal his son. I do not myself propose to explain or even to understand how he can believe, unless it be on the ground that he, by an inherent, God-given perception, recognized in the person of Jesus Christ the all-powerful physician. Indeed, I do not hesitate to assert this as my very deliberate conviction. There is a state of mind just here that has to be experienced to be understood. It admits of no explanation.

There are many abstract propositions in the Scriptures

which can be established by an appeal to facts. We introduce one or two by way of illustration. "When the righteous are in authority the people rejoice; but when the wicked beareth rule the people mourn." Now here we can appeal to facts, and if they do not sustain the assertion the strength of the whole book is impaired. What are the facts? We need not recite the particular cases in the history of Israel. Who can read the history of Israel under Solomon and then under Rehoboam and not yield to the logic of facts? Draw the parallel between the sorrows of Judah under Abijam and her joys under Asa. The list might be much lengthened, and each particular case would furnish proof incontestable of the truth of the inspired declaration. But the force of these is weakened by the suggestion that the history itself is not reliable; that it has been too long since these scenes transpired for the facts in the case to be certainly known. Turn, then, to the history of England and France. Who will controvert the truth of the declaration with the history of these nations open before him?

But take another. "Man that is born of a woman is of few days and full of trouble."—Job xiv. 1. Here the array of *facts* is rather overwhelming to the scientist himself. We all believe that men are mortal and that trouble is their inevitable inheritance. Our faith here rests upon the philosopher's positive knowledge.

But there are other propositions which we accept as true, not because we have in our possession or can find the facts to establish them, but because we confide in the testimony of others. Take, for instance, the propositions that Jesus was born in Bethlehem, that he was the reputed son of Joseph and Mary, that he lived a life of great personal privation, that he performed many miracles, that he was betrayed by Judas Iscariot, that he was crucified by authority of Pontius Pilate the Roman governor, that he was buried and rose again the third day—all these must be received, if received at all, on the testimony of others. They cannot be established by facts observable by us.

But man's moral nature is not involved in the investigation of any or all of these questions. They are purely

intellectual. We receive or reject according as we credit or discredit the testimony adduced in support of them. But there are other questions that are mixed; that is, we receive them partly on the faith we place in the testimony and partly from a conscious sense of their truthfulness. Such I take to be the question as to the origin and authenticity of the Sacred Scriptures. We believe they came from God, and are, therefore, of supreme authority and rightfully demand the obedience of our lives and affections of our hearts for their author.

We can produce external testimony in support of this, but the strongest evidence by far which can be adduced in support of it is found in the Scriptures themselves. The thoughtful man sees in them such a perfect adaptation of truth to his spiritual wants, such a precious lotion for his spiritual nature, that he cries out from the very depths of his soul, I believe they are from God—another one of the grand possibilities of faith. Two worlds tied together. God from his exalted home in glory revealing himself to man—deigning to talk with his erring children here on earth. I thank God I can believe.

Again, we believe there is a God, but how shall we undertake to prove this? The very methods which the philosopher would have us employ would themselves inevitably disprove it. Job says, "God is great, and we know him not."—Job xxxvi. 26. I am inclined to join with Dr. Parker, of London, in saying, "Unknown! unknowable! thanks! I am tired of the known and the knowable; tired of saying this star is fifty millions of miles in circumference, that star is ninety millions of miles further off than the moon, and yonder planet is five times larger than the earth. It is mere gossip in polysyllables." I am so glad to believe that God is—another one of the sublime possibilities of faith.

The scientist is all the while busying himself over the past. He is seeking God in the rocks and in his deep sea-life, or rather he is seeking to prove by these that there is no God. Man's origin with him is every thing, his destiny nothing. He *knows* nothing of the future, he is doubtful of

almost every thing in the past. His creed is well stated in the following lines:

"At the end of every road there stands a wall  
Not built by hands—impenetrable, bare.  
Behind it lies an unknown land. And all  
The paths men plod tend to it, and end there.

Each man according to his humor, paints  
On that bare wall strange landscapes; dark or bright,  
Peopled with forms of fiends or forms of saints,  
Hells of Despair or Edens of Delight.

Then to his fellows, 'Tremble!' or 'Rejoice!'  
The limner cries, 'for to the Land beyond!'  
And ever, acquiescent to his voice,  
Faint echoes from that painted wall respond.

But now and then, with sacrilegious hand,  
Some one wipes off those painted landscapes all  
Muttering, O fools and slow to understand,  
Behold your bourne—the impenetrable wall!

Whereat an eager, angered crow exclaims,  
Better than you dead wall, tho' pale and faint,  
Our faded Edens! better fiends and flames  
By Fancy painted in her coarsest paint

On the blind, bald, unquestionable face  
Of that obstruction, than its cold, unclad  
And callous emptiness, without a trace  
Of any prospect, either good or bad.

And straightway the old work begins again  
Of picture-painting. And men shout and call  
For response to their pleasure or their pain,  
Getting back echoes from the painted wall."

How gloomy! how dark! how cheerless! Does faith reveal no fairer land? "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. . . . But now they desire a better country, that is, an heavenly."—Heb. xi. 13-16.

Reason, logic, and science may all exhaust themselves,



and we are still homeless wanderers, or at best doubtful whither we are going. Faith, and faith alone, reveals to us the beautiful home beyond—the glorious home of the soul.

Read the description of the New Jerusalem by Saint John. Just so long as it is a mere intellectual performance, however grand and symmetrical those walls may be, all made of jasper and gold, still they are cold, and lifeless, and bare; but let faith once breathe upon the soul and it becomes our Father's house in heaven, occupied by the blood-washed throng who have gone on before. Our own loved ones are there. We see them, we hear them, we commune with them. Oh! glorious possibility of faith! Without faith the songs which John heard are all meaningless choruses; with it they are the triumphant shouts of the redeemed in glory. Shall my soul never more shout back its glad response to these heavenly anthems until it hears them by the fact-process?

Science may shut herself up to the task of computing the ages past by exploring the deep, dark labyrinths of the earth, but faith plumes herself on wings of light and reveals to our enraptured vision the city of our God, the resting place of weary souls when freed from doubts and darkness and death, the sweetest, loftiest possibility of faith.

"I will sing you a song of that beautiful land,  
The far-away home of the soul,  
Where no storms ever beat on the glittering strand,  
While the years of eternity roll.

Oh, that home of the soul in my visions and dreams,  
Its bright jasper walls I can see;  
Till I fancy but thinly the veil intervenes  
Between the fair city and me.

That unchangeable home is for you and for me,  
Where Jesus of Nazareth stands;  
The King of all kings forever is he,  
And he holdeth our crown in his hands.

Oh, how sweet it will be in that beautiful land,  
So free from all sorrow and pain;  
With songs on our lips and with harps in our hands,  
To meet one another again."

Learning may laugh, logic may reject, and science ridicule, but glory to God and the Lamb forever, the soul, with conscious joy and unshaken faith, reposes itself amid the everlasting beatitudes of its home in glory. I do not wish to be understood as undervaluing learning. I do not ask for less science, but more faith. We need learning, we need eloquence, we need the highest attainments possible, but above all, and more than all, we need more faith—faith in God, faith in the Bible, faith in the atoning merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. We are not to trust too much in our learning nor attainments. It should ever be remembered that even under the perpendicular rays of an equatorial sun, if we ascend too high we reach the snow-line, for below this it is too cold for vegetation to flourish. It is only when we come down near the sea-level that we luxuriate amid tropical fruits and flowers. It is not on the frigid heights of skeptical science, nor amid the chilling dews of over, conceited learning and logic, that we are to look for the fruits and fragrance of the gospel of our blessed Lord, but on and near the common level of earth's teeming millions.

It was faith, not learning, that furnished the lamb to take Isaac's place on the altar. It was faith that closed the mouth's of the lions and gave Daniel that glorious triumph. It was faith that made victory *possible* to Israel on all her hard-fought fields. It is faith that still nerves her on to her work. May God mightily impress our ministry and Church with the truth that all things are *possible* to him that believeth.

S. L. RUSSELL.

## ART. IV.—TOBACCO.

THE importance of the tobacco question is evinced by the single fact that tobacco is more universally used among mankind than any other one thing except the most ordinary articles of food. It is estimated that nearly 900,000,000 of the inhabitants of the globe are tobacco-users, while 600,000,000 use tea, 400,000,000 use opium, and only 100,000,000 use coffee. An article that holds subject nine-fourteenths of the human race is certainly worthy of attention.

Tobacco-using is commonly regarded, even by those who are devoted to the weed, as a useless and filthy habit, and I have met with few persons who did not regret having formed such a habit. This is particularly so in America, where people are unusually attentive to the promptings of conscience. The European uses tobacco or drinks his wine and beer, scarcely asking the question of right and wrong. It gratifies an appetite and affords pleasure and this is enough. The use of tobacco is hence on the decline in the United States, but not so in Europe. To meet the German or Italian who does not smoke is an exception. Chewing, however, the worst way in which tobacco can be used, is mostly confined to America.

## HISTORY.

Tobacco is indigenous to America, and was first discovered by Columbus in the island of Cuba. The natives smoked it in reeds or rolled it up into cigars. It also grew wild upon the continent, and its use seemed to be universal from Canada to the extreme South. The mound-builder, the Aztec, and the Patagonian all smoked their pipes.

In the year 1560 Jean Nicot, French ambassador to Portugal, brought it from Lisbon to Paris. He presented some

of the seeds to the queen, called the attention of scientific men to it, and introduced its use into fashionable society. It was already extensively used in Spain and Portugal.

Tobacco was introduced into England by Sir Francis Drake in 1560. On his return from America in 1586 he brought with him some pipes, and, assisted by the powerful influence of Sir Walter Raleigh, introduced the practice of smoking into the court. It soon became very popular and the demand for it was so great that the sale of tobacco to England was one of the chief sources of wealth to the colonists of Virginia. This also laid the foundation for the tobacco industry of Virginia, which has always been characteristic of the State, and which unfortunately, too, has made large tracts of its land a barren waste.

Tobacco is now cultivated in all parts of the world, and has every where escaped from cultivation. It may be found growing wild in the various parts of Europe and Asia as well as America. I have frequently seen it in the forests of Arkansas and the Indian Territory.

When once introduced, tobacco became very popular, and though violent measures have been from time to time used for its suppression, it still retains its hold upon the world. It has always been regarded as injurious to man, and its use has been thought by many to be sinful, and hence efforts for its banishment have been made by those in high authority. James I. of England, gave it his attention, and Pope Urban VIII. issued a bull of excommunication against those who should use it. In the seventeenth century its use was prohibited by royal decrees in Persia and Turkey. The early colonists of New England made enactments against it, and particularly forbade its use on Sunday and during divine service. Much has been written against it in modern times, and many of the leading men of the day are seriously considering the question as to whether the world would not be better off without it. Unfortunately, men grow fanatical and cry out against it as a deadly sin and a heinous crime. Most of us have fathers and grandfathers who smoked and chewed all their lives, and yet were good Christians and robust, healthy men. While the intemperate use of tobacco

is certainly very injurious, the moderate use of it is rather a question of economy, propriety, and decency. But more of this hereafter.

#### DERIVATION OF THE WORD.

The origin of the word tobacco is not very certainly known. It is most probably from the word *tabacos*, the name given by the Caribs to the pipe in which they smoked the leaves. Neander, one of the earliest writers on the subject, derived it from *Tabaco* or *Tabasco*, a province of Yucatan. It has been otherwise derived from *Tobago* one of the Carribean islands, and *Tobasco* in the Gulf of Florida.

#### BOTANICAL DESCRIPTION.

The tobacco plant belongs to the order *Solanaceæ* and the genus *Nicotiana*. The genus is named for Jean Nicot, mentioned above. Several species are cultivated, chiefly *Nicotiana tabacum*, which is the common Virginia tobacco. *Nicotiana repanda* and *Nicotiana fruticosa* are cultivated in the West Indies and tropical America. *Nicotiana tabacum*, *Nicotiana macrophylla*, and *Nicotiana rustica* are grown in Europe, the last chiefly upon the shores of the Mediterranean.

The common tobacco plant of the United States (*N. tabacum*) is an herbaceous annual with large, viscid-pubescent, ovate-lanceolate, sessile, decurrent leaves. The larger leaves are near the ground (about 8 by 20 inches), and they decrease in size toward the top. The stem is unbranched and crowned with a loose panicle of rose-colored flowers, which have funnel-shaped corollas, and produce a two-celled capsule containing many black seeds. The leaf is green, ripening to a yellowish brown, and the plant grows four to six feet high.

The order to which tobacco belongs has rather a bad reputation, as almost every genus contains poisonous plants, and they are generally unsightly or have an unpleasant odor. Among the disreputable kindred of tobacco are night-shade (*Solanum nigrum*), horse-nettle (*Solanum Carolinensis*), Belladonna (*Atropa Belladonna*), henbane (*Hyoscyamus niger*), and



Jimson weed (*Datura Stramonium*). The character of the order is somewhat relieved by the Irish potato (*Solanum tuberosum*), pepper (*Capsicum annuum*), tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum*), and the night-blooming jessamine (*Cestrum Parqui*).

#### CHEMICAL ANALYSIS.

Chemical analysis shows the tobacco leaf to contain an unusual number of constituents. Nicotine, nicotianine, and tobacco or malic acid are characteristic. Nitric, hydrochloric, sulphuric, phosphoric, citric, acetic, oxalic, pectic, and ulmic acids are also present. The quantity of mineral matter is large, amounting in some cases to 27 per cent. This is chiefly lime, potash, common salt, magnesia, and silica. The leaf also contains albumen, cellulose, gum, and resin.

Nicotine  $C_{10}H_{14}O_2$  is a colorless, oily liquid, with the odor of tobacco and an acid taste. It has strong basic properties, forming crystalline salts with acids. It is soluble in water, alcohol, and ether, and on exposure to light, becomes redish-brown. It is a deadly poison, even in small doses, and in the minutest quantities causes convulsions and paralysis. It produces death more quickly than any other poison except Prussic acid.

The quantity of nicotine in dried tobacco leaves varies from 8 per cent. in the poorer qualities to less than 2 per cent. in the best Havana tobacco. Virginia tobacco has from 6 to 7 per cent., and the tobacco of Europe from 5 to 8 per cent. Since the physiological properties of tobacco are chiefly due to nicotine, the fine tobaccos are much less harmful than the poorer kinds.

Nicotianine, or tobacco camphor, is a fatty substance obtained by distilling the leaves with water. It forms minute acicular crystals and has a bitter taste and a tobacco-like odor. It is supposed to be identical with cumarin  $C_9H_6O_2$  found in the tonka bean and some other plants. It imparts much of the flavor to tobacco and the kinds which contain most of it are preferred.

Nicotic, or tobacco acid, is characteristic, and has been found to be identical with malic acid  $C_3H_4O_4$ .

By dry distillation of tobacco a dark empyrematic oil is obtained, which has the peculiar odor of old, foul pipe-stems. It has a sharp, acrid taste and is a violent poison. It is a constituent of tobacco smoke. Zeise found the smoke of tobacco to contain besides this empyrematic oil, carbonic oxide, carbonous oxide, butyric acid, ammonia, paraffin, an empyrematic resin, a hydrocarbon, and traces of acetic acid.

#### PRODUCTION.

Tobacco is cultivated nowhere so extensively as in the United States. Most countries scarcely produce enough for home consumption, while the United States exports the greater part of its yield and supplies half the world. The average crop may be taken at 450,000,000 pounds, 250,000,000 of which are sent to foreign countries, chiefly England and Germany. More than one-third of the export goes to Bremen. Liverpool is the next greatest market.

Next to the United States, Cuba grows the most tobacco. Its annual yield is about 60,000,000 pounds. Austria produces about 45,000,000 pounds and France 20,000,000 pounds. Its cultivation is prohibited in England.

#### CULTIVATION.

The seeds are sown in March in beds specially prepared, and in April or May the plants are transferred to the fields and planted in rows two or three feet apart. They are cultivated with the plough and hoe. The leaf being the useful part, care is taken to concentrate there as much of the strength of the plant as possible. In order to attain this object, when ten or twelve leaves are formed the plant is topped to prevent flowering and seeding. All lateral shoots and suckers are carefully removed. When mature, the plants are cut and cured and prepared for shipment. In the curing process the leaves are piled in heaps and caused to undergo a sort of fermentation. By this means the albu-

minous matters are destroyed, the amount of nicotine made less, and aromatic substances produced.

The cultivation of tobacco is not much favored by the best farmers, as it is very exhausting to the soil. The great amount of mineral matter it removes causes the land to wear out very rapidly.

#### FORMS.

The forms in which tobacco is prepared for use are *chewing tobacco*, *smoking tobacco*, *cigars* and *snuff*.

Chewing tobacco is made from leaves of an ordinary or inferior quality by pressing, twisting, or cutting. Liquorice, syrups, and various flavoring matters are used, and sometimes leaves of other plants are mixed in. To make what is called "fine-cut," leaves of the best quality are cut by machinery into fine shreds.

The common smoking tobacco is made from fragments of leaves and stems, and is frequently adulterated.

The greatest amount of tobacco is consumed in the form of cigars. The best cigars come from Havana, partly because the tobacco is of a superior quality, and partly because the Cubans are more skillful in the manufacture. While the American adheres to his pipe, the cigar is of almost exclusive use among the better classes in Europe.

Snuff is prepared by grinding the tobacco in mills. It has been used since tobacco has been known, and is applied to the nose. Ammonical and lead salts and aromatic substances are added, and it is to these and the free nicotine present that snuff owes its irritant action upon the mucous membrane of the nose. The use of snuff in England after its introduction became almost universal, but is now on the decline.

There is another method of snuff-taking which seems to be peculiar to the Southern United States. It is in vogue among the women of the lower classes and the negroes. There is a strong public sentiment against it, however, to which it must eventually yield. The snuff is applied to the tongue with a little spoon, hence the name "dipping." A

wooden or bark brush is frequently used instead of the spoon.

#### REVENUE.

Tobacco is taxed heavily in all countries and thus becomes a source of great government revenue. Its cultivation is prohibited in England in order to increase the imposts.

The annual receipts of the United States from duties on tobacco is near \$45,000,000. That of England is about \$40,000,000. Tobacco is a monopoly in France and the government profit is some \$60,000,000. The duties in Austria amount to \$40,000,000. Notwithstanding this great revenue, it is doubtful whether tobacco is of real profit to a nation, since it takes the people's money without returning a just equivalent. A country, as a whole, is benefited only by that which brings real good to its citizens.

#### PHYSIOLOGICAL ACTION.

All animals are poisoned by nicotine. The fatal dose is extremely small. In experiments on rabbits, it was found that a single drop would produce death in three and a half minutes. Its action is proportionately rapid in other animals. In fish and frogs its action is slow. Reptiles seem to be more easily affected by it. "Some tobacco juice thrown into the mouth of a black snake, six feet long, caused it to writhe spasmodically for a few moments and then become rigid, in which state it remained after death." The following are the results of the observations made by Méliér upon dogs after the subcutaneous injection of nicotine in doses of from one to eight drops: The breathing was affected first and became difficult and anxious. The pupils were dilated and the animals staggered in walking. There was afterwards vomiting and a discharge of ropy mucus from the mouth. Then followed trembling, convulsions, complete exhaustion, paralysis, and death. (Stillé.) Its action has been more carefully studied by Kölliker, Van Praag, and others, and may be summed up thus: "Nicotine primarily lowers the circulation, quickens the respiration,

and excites the muscular system, but its ultimate effect is general exhaustion, both of animal and organic life."

The effects of nicotine upon man have been determined by careful experiments. The following are the observations made by Schröff upon two men to whom he administered nicotine in doses of from  $\frac{1}{32}$  to  $\frac{1}{16}$  of a grain: Even the minutest doses occasioned a burning sensation in the tongue, a hot, acrid irritation in the fauces, and when larger quantities were taken, the entire length of the œsophagus felt as if it had been scraped with an iron instrument. Salivation was abundant. A sense of heat diffused itself to the chest, head, and finger tips, accompanied by general excitement. In larger doses, the brain was more affected and there was heaviness, torpor, sleepiness, indistinct vision, imperfect hearing, dryness of the throat, and labored respiration. In forty minutes a sense of unwonted debility and weariness was perceived, the head could scarcely be held erect, the face was pale, the features relaxed, the extremities became as cold as ice, and the coldness gradually advanced towards the trunk. Faintness ensued with coming insensibility and loss of consciousness. One of the experimenters was attacked in the first half of the second hour with peculiar clonic spasms of the whole body, which increased in violence during forty minutes and lasted an hour. The spasms began by a tremulous movement of the limbs, and gradually involved the whole muscular system, chiefly affecting the muscles of respiration. This act was oppressed and short, every respiratory movement being composed of a number of short and incomplete inspirations. The other experimenter was affected at this period with unusual muscular debility, very laborious respiration, and a rigor. In other respects his symptoms were the same. Both persons, on their return home, felt extremely weak and chilly and walked with ill-assured steps. One of them had a return of the spasms. The following night both were restless and sleepless, and the next day were unwell, tired, sleepy, and without appetite. Three days elapsed before the effects were entirely dissipated. (Stillé.)

Nicotine is one of the most violent of poisons. When



given in sufficient quantity it produces death in man in from two to five minutes.

The symptoms of tobacco poisoning are the same as those of nicotine, except that the intensity is diminished. These symptoms always ensue when one not accustomed to tobacco takes it in any form. They are seen in persons just beginning to chew or smoke. Habit inures the system to it so that large quantities may be used without momentary inconvenience, and in this case its effects are manifested in constitutional disorders.

The poisonous dose cannot be defined. This depends upon the susceptibility of the individual. Poisoning may follow its introduction into the stomach or its external application, and if a sufficient quantity gets into the system death is always the result. There is no antidote, and the only hope of recovery from the poison lies in emetics, heat, friction, artificial respiration, etc. An overdose of tobacco produces nausea, malaise, giddiness, vomiting, colic, diarrhoea, coldness of the limbs, clonic spasms, utter prostration, and, if the dose is sufficient, death. Alarming symptoms sometimes follow the mere inhalation of the emanation from tobacco, and several cases of death are reported from this cause. Serious and sometimes fatal results follow the swallowing of tobacco, or tobacco juice, even by those accustomed to its use. A case is told of a young man who swallowed a piece of crude tobacco. "He became suddenly insensible, motionless, and relaxed, with contracted pupils and a scarcely perceptible pulse. There succeeded convulsions, loud cries, vomiting, and death by syncope or exhaustion." Similar effects sometimes follow immoderate smoking.

All the symptoms of tobacco poisoning are produced by the external application of tobacco and its preparations. Moist leaves applied to the tender parts of the body produce vomiting and exhaustion. The application of the oil from a tobacco pipe to a ringworm on a child caused the usual effects and made the child feeble and sickly for five years thereafter.

Tobacco is an excellent remedial agent, but owing to the

uncertainty of its action and the distressing and sometimes fatal consequences of its administration, it has not been much used as a medicine. It is particularly useful as a nervous sedative. It is also used in diseases of the digestive system, pulmonary affections, dropsy, etc. It is applied externally in the treatment of skin diseases, gout, articular rheumatism, and nasal polypus. It has been used in cholera morbus and lead colic, and is said to be a certain antidote in poisoning by mushrooms.

J. I. D. HINDS.

[To be continued.]

ART. V.—THE PRESBYTERIAN ALLIANCE AND  
THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

THE refusal, last September, of the "Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system" to admit the Cumberland Presbyterian Church as a member of that body has given rise to no little discussion, and there seems to be no prospect of an immediate abatement of the discussion. But neither the refusal nor the discussion will do the Cumberland Presbyterian Church any harm. On the contrary, good will accrue both to it and to those who opposed its admission, whatever may be the final effect on the Alliance itself. The stringent adherents of the Calvinistic, or rather Westminster system, are doubtless honest in their opposition, and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church has neither the desire nor the right to pick the smallest quarrel with them on account of that opposition. All that it desires is that the truth concerning itself should be made manifest, and when this is done it feels assured that justice will be rendered. Those, on the other hand, who have advocated and who still advocate the claims of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church to membership in the Alliance are also honest in their conviction, and they have the advantage not only of being in the majority, but of being themselves members of the Reformed fold. But where, as in this instance, perfect unanimity of feeling is so desirable, mere numerical majority can scarcely be rated at its usual value. There seems to be a difference of opinion as to why the Cumberland Presbyterian Church should not have been admitted into the Alliance. But, of course, there can be but one valid reason, and it is furnished by the second article of the constitution itself of the Alliance. We do not object to the question, Is the last edition of the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession of Faith in harmony throughout

with the old Westminster? Discussion of that question may be forestalled by answering at once: "No, it is not in harmony throughout with the old Westminster; it differs from it in what are supposed to be some important respects." It is sufficiently coincident with it, however, to entitle it to be called "Reformed," even in the technical sense in which that word is used. But the question, after all, is not quite relevant to the point in issue, however interesting and important it may be on other accounts. Why it not relevant? Because the second article of the constitution, and that alone, furnishes the tests of eligibility for admission into the Alliance. The Confession of no *one* Church can as yet be taken as the test, whatever may come to pass in the future. The second article reads thus: "Any Church organized on Presbyterian principles, which holds the supreme authority of the scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, in matters of faith and morals, and whose creed is in harmony with the consensus of the Reformed Confessions, shall be eligible for admission into the Alliance." Now, there can be no dispute as to whether the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is organized on Presbyterian principles. Nor can there be any dispute, of course, as to the next point. The only question, then, is, Is the creed of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in harmony with the consensus of the Reformed Confessions? a confessedly difficult question; and if a similar one were mooted with respect to the creed of more than one other Reformed Church it would be scarcely less difficult. This evident fact will test the still more vital question. Can the Presbyterian Alliance exist as a permanent institution and fulfill the mission originally in the mind of its founders? But the constitution being as it is, no one has any right to go behind it, and hence I, at least, do not very well see how Dr. Briggs, in the January number of the *Presbyterian Review*, could consistently say anything else than that "the proper action of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, if they desire to join the Alliance, is to adopt the constitution, and especially the consensus of the Reformed Confessions." What else could he have said? The "charter members" of the Alliance had a right, of course, to prescribe

the condition of membership, and no body afterward seeking to become a member has any right to expect exemption from that condition. The only difficulty about it is to know what is the consensus. One thing is certain: it is not at this present time the Westminster Confession of Faith, for that, every body knows, contains certain utterances which more Churches than one having membership in the Alliance do by no means admit without much modification. Hence *it* is not the consensus, for consensus, if its etymology is to be relied on, means that which is believed in common. Is the Auburn Declaration the consensus? Whether so or not, it is quite certain that a large and influential element in the Alliance would scarcely hold the Westminster Confession without this modification. Is the Declaratory Statement of the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland the consensus? Whether so or not, it comes about as near being the common belief of the Alliance as the unmodified Westminster Standard—a great deal nearer, I think we may safely say. But, after all, it does not matter much, so far as the Cumberland Presbyterian Church is concerned, *what* the consensus is; for all that it has to do, and all that it can do, is to vote formally and affirmatively on the constitution. When it shall have done this, not a single Church represented in the Alliance will have any right to say that it has not adopted the consensus, for the Alliance has not yet determined what the consensus is; and if it acts wisely, I venture to think, it never will. But if it be wished to act with somewhat more definiteness, the Cumberland Presbyterian Church might, so far as itself is concerned, very safely knock at the door of the Alliance on the basis of the above-mentioned Statement. It may not be a matter of any great moment whether it ever again seeks admission or not, but it would scarcely be in good taste, nor would it be just either to itself or to the truth, to become in any degree offended or pretend to be utterly indifferent. Our General Assembly, it seems to me, might very well afford to say, "Yes, we adopt the constitution, not excepting the first and second articles," although this act would plainly be a virtual committal of itself to the "consensus of the Reformed Churches." But that consensus



has not any formulated existence, and it may be revealed hereafter that either of the above-mentioned Declarations, or our own creed indeed, is about as near it as any other. At any rate, when formulated once for all by the Alliance (which will most probably never be done), it is quite certain that it will not be coincident with the rigid interpretation of the Westminster Standards. If any Church should on this account walk out of the Alliance, it will be the ugliest thing that Church ever did, and the saddest in its effects upon that Church itself—a display of ecclesiastical childishness unworthy of any Christian denomination not already in its dotage. Nobody has any right to care particularly how rigidly this or that Church holds to any given symbol, but when this or that Church knits its brow and protrudes its lip and says, “I won’t be a member of your fraternity unless my doxy is made the doxy of all the rest of you,” that is too bad. On that principle there never could be a fraternity at all. The “Alliance of the Reformed Churches holding the Presbyterian system” would better be careful to have itself largely endowed with charity and Christian catholicity, or this very question of the consensus will prove to be the rock on which it will split into fragments; and would not that be well nigh a disgrace to the Christian religion? We venture to say that the Alliance does not need a creed, and that it cannot have a creed; and in so far as it may have a formulated consensus, that consensus must be an eclecticism, neither wholly this nor wholly that, yet thoroughly Reformed so far as it goes. Better, perhaps, have nothing but an Alliance of Churches holding the Presbyterian polity with nothing but the apostles’ creed for a “consensus,” than that the Alliance should fly asunder like a set of petulant children unable to agree in play. The Cumberland Presbyterian Church has not the slightest desire to be a bone of unhappy contention, but the question is already under discussion, and there is no good reason why it may not be pleasantly settled. If the Presbyterian Alliance is worthy of its existence (and we think it is), the Churches composing it, and those seeking to enter it, ought to be willing to make some compromises for the sake of its

perpetuity. They can very well afford to do this and yet not endanger thereby their respective creeds, nor retard the progress of their distinctive doctrines. It was of old, and it still is, pleasant and beautiful for brethren to dwell together in unity—even if it must be done by holding in temporary abeyance a few favorite but less essential dogmas.

R. V. FOSTER.

## ART. VI.—THEOPNEUSTY.

THE inspiration of the Scriptures is a thing of vital importance to the Church and to every individual Christian. If we are to have as the "man of our counsel" a thesis, never so well written, never so wise, never so philanthropic, and yet merely the production of even the wisest and best of the ages past, then, indeed, would we just as well be following some "cunningly devised fable," since much contained therein, in the very nature of the case, must be mere speculation to any finite mind. But if, on the other hand, we are to be under the tuition of those breathed upon (John xx. 22) from above, who infallibly knew (John xiv. 26, and xvi. 13), who infallibly spoke (2 Peter i. 21), who infallibly wrote (1 Cor. xiv. 37), then, indeed, can those who see lead the blind, and the blind can willingly, gladly follow, knowing that every "ditch" will be avoided. But with the accepted infallibility of the Word and the unquestioned acquiescence in all its claims to inspiration, the writer is under the apprehension, whether true or false, that the vast majority of Bible-readers and Bible-devotees have but a vague idea of what is comprehended by the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures. Perhaps we cannot get the subject before the reader better than in the form of a few interrogations, viz.:

I. Are all portions or only a part of the Scriptures to be accepted as the *truth*? Such a question has, perhaps, occurred to every reader of the blest volume. In the first place, there is no book like the Bible when such close discrimination is necessary to understand what is said, who said it, under what circumstances, for what purposes, etc. Such nice discernment is necessary for no other book. In no other work does such a variety of modifying conditions appear, which have to be duly considered with reference to

the intent thereof, the object in view, the lesson taught, the example proposed. In the consideration of this question much will depend upon the precise definition given to the word "truth." What is truth? This question was asked once of one fully competent to answer, but the poor, unfortunate interrogator had so little interest in the great question that he turned away not waiting for the answer. Webster says, "An established principle." Worcester says, "The doctrines of the gospel." With these definitions accepted, it is very clear that much that is contained in the Holy Scriptures cannot be dignified with the title of *truth*. Christ says, "I am the truth," but much contained therein is not Christ, neither the sayings nor doings of Christ. Christ said, "Thy word is truth," but much of the Scriptures is not in any strict sense God's word. The Psalmist said, "Behold thou desirest truth . . . the inward parts (*i. e.*, in the heart), and in the hidden part thou shalt make me to know wisdom." But there are many things found in the holy volume which are not to be enshrined in that sacred citadel, and which God would have us put far from us. Truth is one thing, and a record of that which is given for our instruction and admonition, and with a view of leading us to the truth, may be a very different thing. Perhaps we might say that is truth, and that only, which we are required to receive (Mark iv. 20), to believe (2 Thess. ii. 13), to obey (1 Peter i. 22), to know (John viii. 32), to love (Zech. viii. 19), and to possess forever (Prov. iii. 3). With this definition of truth, we will be compelled to excise much of the holy writings, and give them some other necessary place in the economy of divine grace.

II. Is every thing found in the Bible *true*? At first thought we might unhesitatingly say, Most certainly. So great is our seeming innate reverence and respect for the Word (we who have been taught immemorially to honor and love it), that the least imputation of anything in it as untrue seems to be very sacriligious. However, a moment's thought and a little examination must convince us that much of it is far from being true. It depends altogether on what is said and who said it whether it is true or not. For

instance, it was not true that man should become wise by disobedience and sin, yet it is so stated, and man evidently believed it. The wise son of Sirach has said, and the history of the race sadly corroborates it, "That the knowledge of wickedness is not wisdom." It was not true that the first fratricide did not know where his brother was, although this is a part of the record. It was not true that Ananias and Sapphira brought all their possessions as a contribution to Christianity, and so unpardonable was the falsehood that their lives were the forfeit. These sad examples are given to show that we must discriminate between the falsity of a thing itself and the record, which may be true, of a false thing. Therefore, as intelligent readers of the Scriptures, we are not to understand that a thing is true just because it is found in the Bible, but only as the Bible emphatically declares it to be true. We are not to understand that all opinions presented or actions done are true or right, but we are to understand that we have an infallible record of just what took place, and as it took place by the different agents mentioned. Of course, this applies chiefly to the historical writings.

The arrant opposer of the book of God adjusts his catapult before the bulwark of divine truth, either ignoring or failing to discriminate between truth and what is true, or between what is found in the Bible and what is endorsed by it. No small part of skepticism, therefore, antagonizes a "man of straw." Truth is not strictly speaking a fact. Truth is always true, never false. A fact may be true or false, *i. e.*, right or wrong. Truth is something that *is*; fact rather something that *is done*. A true record of fact, experiences, mistakes, virtues, and crimes are given us in the Book of books, for "ensamples" and "for our admonition upon whom the ends of the world are come" (1 Cor. x. 11), that we might be led to the truth (2 Tim. iii. 16). How thankful we ought to be for such a record!

III. Is the Scriptures as a whole to be received as the Word of God? The conclusion will readily be formed from what has already been said, that if the entire record is to be accepted as the Word of God, it must be in a varied sense.



Indeed, had we not been told that "all scripture is *given* by inspiration of God," etc. (2 Tim. III. 16), there would have been some portions of it in which a mystery would have remained as to how it could be the Word of God. This is, perhaps, the lowest sense of all ideas of inspiration, when it is simply "given." He has preserved and transmitted to us knowledge which we could have had in no other way—from no other source. It may not be God's Word in any other sense, but on the other hand, the words and doings of angels, men, and demons, yet in his great goodness he has given us an infallible account of these things. But it must be the Word of God in a very different and higher sense, when it contains an expression of *his* ways and thoughts and will concerning us. This brings to our notice also another interesting phase of the idea of inspiration—that is, its extent. The plenary verbal inspiration of the Bible is a subject which has been up before the Church at different periods of her history, and has doubtless been duly considered. A part of the Socinian school held that portions of the canonical Scriptures were verbally inspired, while other portions were not. Some, however, have gone much further than this, and asserted that it is *verbatim* the production of the Holy Ghost through the canonical writers. Gaussen, for one, held to this theory of verbal dictation, and then afterwards renounced it as being extravagant and as fruitful of error and mischief. The great majority of able Bible expositors, however, hold that it is not necessary to plenary verbal inspiration that we have an *ipsissima verba* dictation by the Holy Ghost on all subjects and facts, however well the inspired writers might have been informed with regard to them. It is not understood that we are to be word-worshipers. Thoughts are of more importance than words, and if plenary inspiration (defined by Worcester "that kind, or degree, which excludes all mixture of error") gives us divine thoughts infallibly, if not divine words, we most surely have the revealed will of God. We recently had the privilege of listening to a Bible-reading from one of the most distinguished among Bible students, and he took the strong ground that every *word* was inspired, and, furthermore, every "mood, tense, number,

and person." It was advocated with unusual ability and fervor. It is not the purpose of this portion of this article to combat this theory, so much as to state some insuperable difficulties in the mind of the writer to its adoption. It is not quite clear whether the Reader adopted merely the theory of Michaelis—*i. e.*, portion of it word-inspired and portion not—or the extreme theory of Gausson, Calamy, and others; but the impression is he took the latter theory. And now let us say it is a salutary theory, if it can be established. It would certainly tend to inspire a greater reverence for the Word, if possible, to know that these are not even human words. Men would not so unblushingly mutilate the Scriptures in quotation, giving what they understood to be the sense in their own words for God's words, if they were awed by the sacrilege of it. In fact, this was one argument made use of by the Reader. I am in love with the theory on moral principles. A very few of the arguments used will be suggested.

The prophets declared with all authority that the "*word* of the Lord came unto them;" and "*holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*;" "*and to the apostles words should be given*," etc. "*Thus saith the Lord*," occurs twenty-four times in Malachi of only four chapters. "*It is written*," is found eighteen times in the Epistle to the Romans. "*The promise was made to Abraham, and his seed; not seeds, as of many, suspending the meaning on even the number of the word seed*." "*Balaam and the prophet, although made to prophesy against their will, could not change the words* (Num. xxii. 38; 1 Kings xiii, 21)." "*Live by every word*," etc.

This is a short epitome, but it will serve to show the drift of thought. In the first place, the *ipsissima verba* theory makes the canonical writers mere amanuenses of the Holy Ghost, men-machines, so to speak, which is not the usual way the Lord makes use of his intelligent creatures, at least when they can and will be used. This theory leaves no room to account for the great varieties of style as exhibited by the different sacred writers. They showed up the different mental castes of the people of every age in which they

wrote. Why do we not have the highly-poetic and hyperbolic style of the prophets in our Lord's gospels? To institute a closer comparison, why is not the gospel by Mark as pure and elegant in the original tongue as that written by Luke? It does seem that in some sense these impressed their own idiosyncracies in the language they used, as well as the characteristics of the age in which they lived. Again, if *words* are to be made sacred, how are we to account for the great discrepancies found in passages in the New Testament quoted from the Old Testament? In many cases *words* are changed, and in some quotations omitted altogether. The Saviour rebuked the tempter by quotations of scriptures, but they are not the identical words found elsewhere, yet he says we must live by *every word*, etc., showing he does not use "word" in that verbal sense. In fact, the best exposition of many passages in both Testaments is their quoted paraphrase by other writers in another place. There is also a translation difficulty. When thoughts are changed from one language to another they change words. I do not mean by this simply a change of form; this cannot be avoided, of course. But I mean the equivalent word is not always used. Dr. Dick says, "Words are arbitrary signs for which equivalents may be substituted." True, if you have the equivalent. But it is a well-known fact that no one language furnishes verbal equivalents for every word found in other languages, and that a circumlocution must be employed to bring out the full meaning. In some places the original text is burdened, as in 2 Cor. iv. 17, and our periphrastic translation does not relieve it altogether. What, then, becomes of the inspiration, *ipsissimis verbis*? But more, who does not know that we have a *liberal* translation in many places, when we could have a *literal* one? Take the great commission, "Go therefore and teach (disciple) all nations, . . . and, lo, I am with you alway (all days), even unto the end of the world." There is no objection to the translation whatever, only noting that it is *liberal*, not *literal*. Again, take the large number of italicised words as found in our English translation, which the average reader would suppose must be greatly emphasized (although it might be difficult in many

places to see the force of the emphasis), and the fact is they do not appear in the original at all, even as much as half of a verse, as in 1 John II. 23. Is so much uninspired according to the "word" theory? It would be satisfaction to know that we had divine words, even in a verbal sense, but if the ground is untenable why claim it? Alexander Campbell said it gave him great satisfaction and pleasure to read the original text, for then he knew he had the identical words as they fell from the lips of our Saviour. This is not capricious by any means, for there is a sacredness about even the very words used by him in whose mouth was found no guile (1 Peter II. 22), and it would be interesting to have also the intonations of his voice as he spake those "wonderful words of life."

It was not necessary that the canonical writers should have the same assistance to write about things familiar, as it was about things of which they knew nothing and could know nothing; hence, all writers on this subject have admitted there must have been degrees of inspiration. The degrees usually mentioned are those of (a) superintendence, (b) elevation, and (c) suggestion. In such cases as prophecy, commands, promises, etc., they must have spoken and written in *words* which the Holy Ghost gave. In many cases the inspired thoughts were mysteries even to them, and then reasonably *the* words could not have been their own. But of those things of which they were "eye-witnesses," speaking of what they knew and testifying of what they had seen, it does not seem reasonably necessary (humanly speaking) that more than a general superintendence should have been given, keeping them absolutely free from any error or mistake.

There is just one more thought before we leave the subject. Some of the epistles are in the form of pastoral letters, and were written with great familiarity. Are we to understand that every subject treated of was a matter of inspiration? Did it take an inspired man to write about his "parchments" and "cloak" and where he was going to spend the "winter?" The best explanation, perhaps, is that inspiration properly extended to spiritual things only, "things of a

religious and moral nature." (See Horne's Introduction.) It was not the particular work of these writers, or even the Saviour himself, to give us scientific facts, or philosophic theories, or sociological rules, or the world might have been vastly wiser on these subjects in its infancy than it is to-day. True, when they touched upon these subjects, in explanation or enforcement of moral truth, we are not to understand that they were allowed to err. God would not thus defeat or allow defeated his own wise and gracious purposes. The apostle, in 1 Cor. vii., speaks in some places as though he were inspired and in other places as though he were not. How are we to understand him unless on some such explanation as given above? Said he, I speak not of commandment, but by permission. Again, I have no commandment of the Lord; yet I give my judgment. Said he, I *suppose* that this is good, etc. These were questions of expediency, and as their attention or non-attention did not particularly affect Christian morals, he had no commandment of the Lord. We accept his decision, however, as right and proper, just as if he had said, I command. He was not allowed to err even on questions of expedience, for said he, "I think also that I have the Spirit of God." But on another question in the same chapter (moral question), he said, "I command, yet not I, but the Lord."

Whatever may be our views of inspiration, in kind or degree, let us never doubt that we have the infallible word of God; let us hear it and believe it; for One greater than all has said, "If any man hear my *words*, and believe not, I judge him not; . . . the *word* that I have spoken, the *same* shall judge him in the last day."

C. P. DUVAL.



ART. VII.—H. M. IRWIN'S CRITICISM ON THE  
ARTICLE ENTITLED "THE MOSAIC JURISPRU-  
DENCE."

MESSRS. EDITORS: I have been traveling on our western frontier and in the wilderness since the first of May last, and did not see the October number of the *QUARTERLY* till nearly four months after it was issued.

Every intelligent person who has read the article in the April number of 1880, entitled, *The Mosaic Jurisprudence*, discovered at once that its scope and drift was to bring out the important fact that the world preceding, contemporaneous with, and subsequent to the time of Moses, but which knew nothing of him or his laws, had not been abandoned of God and left like a rudderless vessel on tempestuous seas to be driven upon shoals and rocks without power to avert the disaster. It was to show that great commonwealths sprang into existence, organized state governments, ordained beneficent laws, grew powerful and rich, without a "single ray of light from the burning brow of Mount Sinai," or a single word of advice or admonition from the great Hebrew law-giver or any of his contemporaries or successors amongst the children of Israel. This proposition, we think, was fully maintained by a brief sketch of the history of the leading systems of law which existed in the world down to the time of Christ.

This being the aim of the author, certain words and terms that seemed of obscure meaning in their connection should have been interpreted in the light of the leading thought of the article. Hence, when it was stated that the spirit of the laws of Moses had been *anticipated* by Confucius, the Pharaohs, the Greeks, the Romans, and the Aztecs, the natural and legitimate impression that would be received by a candid reader was that as to the several nations referred to who

were subsequent to Moses in point of time, had, nevertheless, anticipated him in point of fact. A nation which organizes government and ordains laws which may be identical in spirit and in their general scope with those of another nation, although long subsequent in point of time to the latter, but never having had any knowledge thereof, may be said, in all truth, to have anticipated the first. A simple illustration will throw light on the point. An American makes an important discovery in the application of certain scientific principles in mechanics. His invention is introduced all over the country and is considered of great value in the industrial pursuits of the people, yet in fact this identical machine was invented long prior to the time of the American inventor by a scientist of Germany. Now, as to this country and our people the American invention anticipated the German, although the latter was first in point of time. This fact has actually arisen in the history of patent-rights in this country and in Europe. The American inventor, if subsequent in point of time, has always received his patent unless it could be shown he had knowledge of the previous discovery.

No sane man who has carefully read the history, not of the people and country merely, but of the jurisprudence of Greece and Rome will for a moment contend that the law-givers of either country ever even heard of the Mosaic jurisprudence or of the children of Israel. There is not a syllable of authentic history that will go to sustain such a supposition. The Greek was the exclusive architect of the plan of government and judicial system of his own country. The Roman, it is true, borrowed largely for the material of his system of laws, but he borrowed from his neighbor, the Greek, and not from the Jew. But even this is denied stoutly by certain Roman law-writers and historians.

And as to Confucius being subsequent in point of time to Moses, I presume that no one will contend that he ever heard of the great Hebrew leader, or knew anything of his laws and rules of government which had been provided for the Jewish commonwealth. Yet our critic does maintain without the slightest shadow of authority that

Asia was peopled by the sons of Abraham, and that the great similarity between Chinese and Jewish jurisprudence is to be referred to that event, whereas, in point of fact, the children of Israel never had a distinctive government till they were released from Egyptian authority, about four hundred years after the sons of Jacob emigrated into that country. At the time the six sons went out to the East, Abraham and his son Isaac constituted the whole of the chosen race, and all the law and government of which they had any knowledge was that which appertained to the family and tribal relation.

I presume my learned critic will not pretend that the Aztecs of the American continent derived any aid from Moses or any of his race in the formation of their enlightened system of jurisprudence—a system which was the first in all history to establish a judiciary separate from and independent of the executive and legislative authority.

My critic is scarcely fair in saying that I referred the formation-period of the common law of England to a time prior to the period of Moses. I did not say that or anything like it; but on the contrary, stated that the power of Christianity was very feeble in England during the period that the foundations of the common law were being formulated; and this proposition I still maintain.

I submit the general proposition in vindication of my position that any and every people who evolved, systematized, and organized a public code of laws, without any aid from or knowledge of the Hebrew legal economy, whether they lived prior to, contemporaneous with, or subsequent to the time of the Hebrew commonwealth, in point of fact *anticipated* the great Jewish law-giver. So that the truth of history is maintained in my position, notwithstanding the "dates from chronological tables" may seem to teach a different doctrine. These dates from chronological tables remind me very strongly of what I have often seen in a court-house, when one lawyer would demur to another's pleading because he had omitted to dot his i's and cross his t's. I do not object to candid criticism when the ground for it is substantial and tenable.

But the true source of the objections to my theories, I think, are to be found in the remark that I had placed the Mosaic jurisprudence in too limited a sphere in the history of the world. This objection I expected would be raised by some unlearned theologian, but I scarcely looked for it from so well-read a lawyer as my reviewer seems to be. I know it has been the fashion to refer to the Mosaic laws as the source of all good law in the world. I have heard the doctrine from the pulpit often. But it is not true. The fact is, that several of the ancient nations, notably Egypt, Greece, and Rome, were far better governed than the Jews; not because the Mosaic system was not equal to any in the world, but because the people were so stubborn and impracticable. Time and again the authority of Moses was supplemented by visitations of the divine vengeance on the people for their disobedience. It is true, also, that the nations referred to made infinitely greater progress in literature, arts, eloquence, and statesmanship than the Jews ever did at any period of their history. In selecting the Jews as the depository of the symbols of the visible Church, and as furnishing an ancestry to the coming Saviour, God did not reprobate the balance of the world to the condition of anarchy, ignorance, darkness, and death.

R. C. EWING.

ART. VIII.—PROF. JAMES MACGREGOR, D.D., OF  
SCOTLAND, ON THE CUMBERLAND PRESBY-  
TERIAN CONFESSION.

THE *Catholic Presbyterian*, for February, 1881, contains a number of highly interesting articles on various subjects, pertaining chiefly to religion. This international journal is published in London and New York, and is edited by Prof. W. G. Blackie, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E. G. D. Mathis, D.D., is corresponding editor. Price per year, \$3.00. This, by the way, will prove a valuable publication to ministers who wish to keep themselves well informed of the movements of Presbyterianism on both sides of the Atlantic.

The eleventh article is headed, Open Council: Doctrinal Position of the Cumberland Presbyterians, United States, by Rev. Prof. MacGregor, D.D.

The recent discussions concerning the exclusion of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church from the Pan-Presbyterian Council, probably induced Prof. MacGregor to procure a copy of the Confession of Faith. Having compared this Confession with the Westminster, he sent to the editor of the *Catholic Presbyterian* for publication some notes prepared for his own use.

I propose to copy a large part of these notes, "made for my own use," but published in the *Catholic Presbyterian*. This I do for these reasons:

First, to indicate to Cumberland Presbyterians what a learned professor in the land of their ecclesiastical, and largely of their natural, ancestry thinks of our Confession of Faith.

Secondly, to enable our readers to see the contrast between the bold and self-confident style in which Scotch Presbyterians speak of the hard points in the Westminster system, and the



cringing and apologetic style in which American Presbyterians speak of these hard points.

Thirdly, for the purpose of making a few statements in the "notes."

I am glad the professor thought proper to examine our book, the "new Confession," as he calls it; and as he chose the Westminster for his touch-stone of truth, his standard of orthodoxy, I am very glad that, weighed in such balances, we Cumberland Presbyterians are found wanting, and a verdict of guilty is accordingly rendered against us. Tried by the Bible, an impartial court, the verdict might have been different.

I am also very grateful to the professor for the very charitable hope that the confessors are better than the Confession. This is what I have always thought about good or pious Calvinists. Bad Calvinists very well illustrate their creed.

The professor's first criticism is upon chap. xx., sec. 4. Commenting on this section, he says, "The Cumberland Presbyterian brethren give no ground to their nation for dealing with Mormonism. But with no other exceptions that I have observed, the remodeling has reference to the distinguishing doctrines of Augustinianism, in its modern form of Calvinism"—(a very obscure sentence). Now, I really supposed our critic knew that Christians in the United States dealt with evil "conversation, *i. e.*, way and manner of living," such as Mormonism, not as Churches but as citizens—by the ballot and through the civil courts. But I will cheerfully excuse this blunder. Perhaps it was fore—well, it is included in "*whatsoever comes to pass.*"

But why did he not hurl his "omission of doubtful wisdom" against our American fathers? Their Confession is identical with the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession. Of course the professor *knew this*. Such groundless partiality rather savors of "Augustinianism."

I really like our critic, his blunders notwithstanding. I like his earnestness, his candor, his zeal for his faith, his bold utterance of his opinions. They seem to be generally wrong. I like his charity. He does not close the door of heaven against us, though he cannot admit us within the pale of his

orthodoxy; calls us brethren; has "no desire to call us ecclesiastical nick-names;" calls us by the name our mother gave us—Cumberland Presbyterians, "the Cumberland Church," "the Cumberlanders." Nick-names are the lowest kind of slang. They hurt no one but the slang-mongers. Whether it is to our credit or discredit, we are as truly Presbyterians as any Church on earth. Every tyro in church polity knows this; also knows that Calvinism is restricted to no form of church polity. We, as a Church, do not hold to the name because the Westminster Assembly adopted it, but because it was an apostolic institution. As a Church, we beg for recognition no where, but if we are to be recognized at all, common decency requires that it shall be by our true name and not by slang titles.

Some of our brethren on this side of the Atlantic have no need of an exemplar in this regard. Others can learn something on the subject of denominational etiquette if they choose. But to the notes.

"The attempt to 'remodel' into Arminianism a document so thoroughly Calvinistic as the old Confession, results in an amalgam which is interesting as a product of intellect. But evangelical Christians have a far profounder interest in the spiritual character and tendency of that doctrine which is so strangely infused into the old Confession, as if a new spirit has taken possession of an old body. Perhaps on account of the juxtaposition, the Arminianism here does not present to us the aspect of Wesleyanism, which originated in a positively spiritual evangelical movement, but rather the aspect of Morisonianism in its harsher and more meager development, as originating in intellectual negation of the Augustinianism 'doctrine of grace.' Of course I speak only of the (new) Confession, not of the confessors who, we trust, are true Christians in their hearts, and, therefore, devout Augustinians on their knees—before *the throne* of grace. This Confession appears to me to represent a different kind of religion from that represented by the Westminster Confession."

Prof. MacGregor does not seem to know that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church "originated in a positively spir-

itual evangelical movement," the most extensive and enduring ever witnessed in the United States, which commenced under the faithful preaching of Rev. James McGready, a Presbyterian preacher, who, like Wesley, was converted after he had entered the pulpit, and who, after his conversion, preached with a power truly marvelous in his day; and that the doctrinal scheme was the result of a reaction against Calvinistic doctrine, provoked more by its impracticability, as then held and preached by Presbyterian ministers generally, than by any morbid propension for creed-making.

Who preaches distinctive Calvinism in a positively spiritual evangelical movement? Not the sensible man whose soul is all aglow with love to God and sympathy for helpless, heart-broken penitents. Westminster limitarianism is utterly out of place on such occasions. "Morisonianism" had a somewhat similar origin, as well as Wesleyanism. I wonder if our brother has not felt the keen edge of Morisonian logic?

Prof. MacGregor next takes up the five points of Calvinism and compares the Confessions in relation to them.

"The doctrine of *Providence* (chap. v.) directly affects the whole life of religion, as consisting in dependence on God. On this doctrine the old Confession is ~~very~~ elaborate and masterly. And at the very outset we mark a significant contrast, the old making God's governments to extend to 'all creatures, actions, and things,' where the new speaks only of 'all creatures and things'—a significant omission to one acquainted with the Arminian metaphysic regarding will; while the significance here is deepened by the avowed plan of remodeling, 'expunging *what the sinner thought erroneous.*' The old Confession having thus placed the will of rational creatures among the governed, traces the government back to absolute supremacy of purposing free-will in God, 'according to his infallible fore-knowledge and the free and immutable counsel of his own will.' On this it reduplicates when it goes on to speak of all events as 'occurring to the nature of second causes, either necessarily, *freely*, or contingently,' though 'in relation to the fore-knowledge and decree of God, the first cause, all things come to pass

immutably and infallibly.' It further makes this providence, which goes beyond a 'bare permission,' to 'extend itself even to the first fall, and all other sins of angels and men.' These utterances are manifestly fitted to make men feel completely dependent on God. But it is quite different in the new Confession, from which these utterances are simply 'expunged.' But it is significant, in like manner, that in relation to the great dogma of *permission* of sin, the new Confession simply 'expunges' the utterances of the old. 'This their sin,' says the old, 'God was pleased . . . to permit, having purposed to order it to his own glory;' where the new has, 'was pleased to order, through Christ, for his own glory, and the good of all them that believe'—an omission amounting to effective negation. Indeed, the new Confession has no real definition of providence, as amounting to Divine determination of events, even in the physical world; for the word 'govern,' when not further defined, is consistent with the view that God simply 'reigns,' but does not 'govern,' in the sense required by those who need to pray. When our delegates were storm-tossed in mid-Atlantic, it is not clear from this Confession that it would be rational on our part to pray for their safety to God as one whom 'the winds and waves obey.' That, however, may be simply an inadvertance. But it is clear that, in relation to what for us is by far the more important part of divine government, in the sense of effective determination—in relation, that is, to the impulses and actions of rational creatures—the confessors have carefully 'expunged' every thing that would imply an actual or possible determination of the will of the creature by direct action of God's will, as distinguished from the indirect influence of moral suasion. And the view thus resulting of the world and its history in relation to God, represents a different species of religion from that represented by the utterances 'expunged.'"

The reader will note that the objection to the "new Confession" is the omission to say that God "doth uphold, direct, dispose, and govern all *actions*." (See Confessions, chap. v., sec. 1.) The sense in which the Westminster Confession uses the words, "direct," "dispose," and "govern,"

is in rigid accord with *necessity*. (See Westminster Confession, chap. III., sec. 1, and chap. v., sec. 4.)

Providence or government, according to the Westminster theory, is simply the execution by divine power of the eternal and all-comprehending decree of chap. III. As the decree embraces all things, even the volitions of men, so God's government, by providence, accomplishes all things, the good and the evil alike. In order to make a show of harmony between the theory and the facts of freedom and moral accountability, resort is had to the figment of two wills in the divine mind—the secret or decretive will and the pleasurable or revealed will. The decretive will is the rule of administration, and determines the volitions, the acts, the destinies of men. The revealed will is the rule of accountability and retribution, or determines the right and wrong of human actions. The two wills are sometimes coincident and sometimes in conflict. The decretive is incapable of violation. No creature ever did or can violate it. To do so would be to set aside a divine decree; and as things are decreed, therefore "all creatures, actions, and things, from the greatest even to the least," are in exact accord with this decretive will.

Whatever accords with the revealed will is right, but only what accords with the decretive will is possible. Therefore actions are right only in cases in which the revealed and decretive will are coincident, and wrong in all instances in which they are in conflict.

Now, the government of God in the sense of the Westminster Confession, is simply the execution in time of this decree of universal foreordination in eternity.

But as Cumberland Presbyterians reject this theory of decrees and providence as destructive of moral distinction and of all moral government, properly so called, they very appropriately struck out the word "actions." Whether they acted wisely or unwisely, I am willing that even Scotland shall decide a century hence.

The reader will observe that in the quotation taken from the Confession, chap. vi., sec. 1, the word "over-rule" has slipped out and the word "order" has taken its place. Prof.



MacGregor, of course, did not misquote intentionally. The blunder occurred, it is presumed, in the office of the *Catholic Presbyterian*.

A similar error occurs, probably in the same way, in the quotation from chap. III., sec. 1, where the word "decreed" is replaced by the word "declared."

The first error perverts the sense of the text; the other makes nonsense. The new Confession would, no doubt, seem to our Westminster friends bad enough when correctly printed—a veritable "jumble." Of course, we regret that the "jumble" had to be jumbled. But it, of course, resulted from some sort of necessity, and must be excused.

"2. The doctrine (chap. III.) of the divine *decree* or decrees bids men see in eternity (out of time, in God) that which the doctrine of providence shows them in time. The old Confession makes the sovereign will of God to have 'firmly and unchangeably ordained whatsoever comes to pass' (adding that this is in such a way as to leave intact, and, indeed, establish whatever of will, liberty, or contingency naturally has place in or among the creatures). It goes on to affirm that even when the event is dependent on conditions, the decree is unconditional—not caused by the condition foreseen. And it expands this general statement into detailed utterances regarding the destiny of rational creatures in general, and the eternal salvation or perdition of sinners in special, so as to make all events in the history of the universe to be absolutely predetermined by that sovereign free-will of God. Here, too, the doctrine makes men feel completely dependent on the good pleasure of God as King. This, again, is not the doctrine of the new Confession. The 'remodeling' here—we pass over the caricature of Calvinism in the foot-note already referred to—consists mainly in carefully 'expunging' every thing which affirms or implies that sovereign foreordination which is the whole burden of the old Confession. And by way of 'adding what they considered true,' there is again inserted what is at best irrelevant, common-place, and what in the circumstances is evasion, amounting to effective negation. Thus, instead of the words I have quoted from the old, the new has, 'determined to act

or bring to pass what should be for his glory'—['act' is surely intended for 'do']. And, then, instead of the elaborate exhibition of all-pervading sovereignty which follows (in seven out of eight sections) in the old Confession, the new has this jumble: 'God has not declared any thing respecting his creature man, contrary to his revealed will or written Word [the *comma* here is a manifest slip]; which declares his sovereignty [decretive? No] over all his creatures, the ample provision he has made for their salvation [whose? all his creatures?!]. His determination to punish the finally impenitent with everlasting destruction and to save the true believer with an everlasting salvation.' No word here of salvation made sure by the sovereign love of God, but only the suggestion of a chance of salvation, the event depending on the ungodly heart of man."

In the above extract Prof. MacGregor refers to foot-note and refers to chap. II., instead of chap. III., where it belongs. This foot-note he calls a caricature of Calvinism. Of course it is! Whoever saw a pithy or unanswerable argument against Calvinism that was not by some of the elect called a "caricature"? I suppose the only way to avoid such an ungracious charge is to say, *substantially*, that Calvinism contains "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," which assertion, I think, would be the greatest possible caricature. But why did not the good brother point out the caricature, and give his readers the privilege of judging for themselves? To make a charge of caricature and not attempt to sustain it by facts, is simply to injure the party charged to the extent of the personal influence of him who makes it.

By the way, the man who wrote that note was raised a Calvinist, and when a young man was an officer in the Presbyterian Church before his conversion to God; was remarkable for his fine sense, conscientiousness, and exemplary piety. He knew what Calvinism is as expounded by its own admirers and defenders. He was too honest to misstate his honest convictions. I think he made no caricature.

The principal topic in division second of Prof. MacGregor's notes is "the divine *decree* or decrees." The professor's

theological sensibilities seem to be severely shocked at what he evidently deems an inexcusable mutilation of the old Confession. The excising process truly was severe. It was intended to cut off what was deemed erroneous and superfluous, and retain only what was true and useful. Divine Providence seems to have approved, at least to have tolerated, what was done. Whether it was decreed or not, I leave for those who claim to know more about decrees to judge.

Many good reasons existed to induce the compilers of the new Confession to reject the greater part of the third chapter of the old Confession.

Of those, I will here notice only one. The first sentence asserts that "God from all eternity did . . . freely and unchangeably, ordain whatsoever comes to pass." This decree, it is universally admitted, included all the motives and acts of all angels and men; every thing good, every thing bad. Prof. MacGregor says this "sovereign foreordination is the whole burden of the old Confession." Every thing in the book is intended to be in harmony with this doctrine.

Now, this decree, in the judgment of the great majority of mankind, either destroys moral distinctions or makes God the author of sin. Moral distinctions admitted, the indictment against the old Confession is that it attributes to the infinitely holy God the authorship of sin.

The bold disclaimers at the close of chap. III., sec. 1, and at the close of chap. v., sec. 4, bring no relief. The plea of "not guilty" is no proof of innocence. On the contrary, when this plea is set up before the charge is made, as in this case, the plea itself creates a suspicion of guilt. If Calvinists had shown how God could decree sin and actually bring it to pass, and yet not be the author of it, then their disclaimers would be valid, but not till then. But the prisoner is not required to prove his innocence, though always at liberty to do so if he can.

In the judgment of mankind generally, to decree a thing and bring it to pass by any means whatever, is to be the author of that thing. The contrary proposition is self-

contradictory—is to affirm and deny. Bible facts are more satisfactory than human logic.

Pharaoh decreed the destruction of the male Hebrew children and appointed the midwives the executives of the decree. Whose sin was it? Pharaoh decreed it; the women acted it. To whom does the Bible attribute it? Herod decreed the slaughter of the children of Bethlehem and *sent forth* and slew them. The decree was Herod's; its executives were his minions. Whose was the sin? A Sunday-school scholar of ten years old would answer, Herod's; and an Edwards or Leibnitz, nay, even Infinite Wisdom, could not falsify the answer. Herod Antipas decreed the death of John the Baptist and sent his soldiers to behead him. Whose sin was it? Every one except those who have abjured the intuitions of reason, and have enveloped themselves, or permitted themselves to be enveloped, in a metaphysical fog, would say, Herod's. Let it be observed that in all these cases the authors of the decrees were not their executives or actors. But according to Westminsterism, God is both the author and executive of the decree of all sin, the external actors being nothing but the helpless instruments in his hand; even their emotions, motives, volitions, and external acts sustaining to his omnipotent will only the relation of effects to their causes. To say that God decrees sin and brings it to pass, decrees and adjusts all the appetencies of the soul, and the objects of these appetencies; all the motives of action and the very volitions themselves, yet is not the author or efficient cause of sin, is more than a mystery; it is in the judgment of mankind a contradiction.

But we are told that God brings sin to pass in such a way that the "sinfulness thereof proceedeth only from the creature and not from God." Let us see whether this, in the nature of the case, is really possible.

Sin is an abstract quality and has no existence, only in the concrete, or as a quality of an act or habit. All moral acts consist of two parts, the volitions and the qualities of the volitions or acts. (1) The volitions, apart from their qualities, have no moral character, are neither virtuous nor sinful,

rewardable nor punishable. To decree an act without moral quality would be to decree neither sin nor holiness. To decree sin it is necessary to decree both the act and the quality of the act. There are but two classes of moral qualities, sinfulness and unsinfulness. Hence, to decree sin at all is to decree the sinfulness of the act of which it is the quality; and the act and the sinfulness of the act both proceed from God in exactly the same sense. But chap. v., sec. 4, of the Westminster Confession, virtually admits, or rather affirms, that the sin proceeds from God. Therefore the sinfulness proceeds from God. (2) The motive of the act determines the moral quality of the act. Every body understands this. But it is acknowledged by all Calvinists (not to acknowledge this is not to be a Calvinist) that God decrees all the motives that operate upon all created minds. Therefore God decrees the qualities of all acts, and is truly the efficient cause of all sinfulness.

But we are told the decree does no violence to the will of the creature. It was certainly very kind to give the world this information, otherwise there would have been a general misapprehension. It happened in this case that the disclaimer is true, not in the true sense of freedom, but in the Calvinistic sense of freedom—certainly no violence is done to the will of the creature. This will, in the sense intended, is nothing more nor less than the echo or the effect of the Omnic will, the decretive will of God.

It would be rather unscientific, if not unintelligible, to say that the cause does violence to the effect. The doctrine is just as true of the reprobate as of the elect—violence is not done to the will of the creature. But the reprobate is none the less the victim of a remorseless destiny, but he necessarily chooses the means of his own destruction.

By the way, this doctrine of necessitated freedom is, perhaps, very valuable as a revealer of the secret counsels of the divine will, because it places before the eye of consciousness of every man an infallible index of the secret or decretive will of God in relation to himself. By making careful note of his individual volitions as attested by his consciousness, he can read with unerring accuracy in relation



to himself—the record of—the book of Fate would be the true word, but through courtesy I write *decrees*. He cannot read the record of his future destiny, but of the passing moment only, as his own volitions, etc., pass through his consciousness. In fact, if the Westminster theory is true, then every angel, man, and devil is just what the secret will of God makes him, and the whole universe in all its aspects is a revelation of that decretive will. As the emotions lie on the side of the pleasurable and revealed will of God, and not on the side of the decretive or disposing will, how easy to turn Edwards' logic against him when he undertakes to prove that unless every event, whether right or wrong, is in exact accord with the disposing will, God must be infinitely unhappy. If the argument is worth anything at all, its whole force lies against the Edwardean theory, which puts the infinitely wise and holy God under some sort of necessity of decreeing or bringing to pass sin, the only object of his abomination.

Believing the doctrine of decrees as taught in the Westminster Confession essentially false, or if true, incapable of proof, and of bad rather than good practical tendency, and withal to be a scheme of false philosophy rather than theology, the compilers of the new Confession deemed it proper to say only what is manifestly comprised in God's revealed will, without attempting to fathom the contents of his secret will. Secret things belong to God; revealed things to men.

I never heard a Calvinist object to the third chapter of the new Confession because of what it says. They object, if they object at all, to what it does not say. Indeed, the late venerable Dr. Lapsley used to say that he believed every thing in the new Confession, but insisted that it did not say enough. I think the old Confession says vastly too much, and I am very well satisfied that a large majority of Presbyterian ministers in the United States would prefer that the Westminster Assembly had said less. I am further fully persuaded that if the matter were clearly understood, nine-tenths of the laity of the Presbyterian Church in the United States would prefer the third chapter of the new to the third

chapter of the old Confession. I further avow it as my opinion, that if the Westminster Assembly had said in reference to decrees and the logically correlated subjects, just substantially what the Cumberland Presbyterian Confession says, the Presbyterian Church in this country would be five times as strong as it now is. It is not probable that against such a Confession there would have occurred any great popular reaction, such as Unitarianism in New England, Universalism (in some of its forms), New Schoolism, which was a reaction against the literal and logical interpretations of some points, and Cumberland Presbyterianism. In addition to these organizations, which are largely the result of popular reaction against universal foreordination and its logical correlatives, no man can tell how many men have been driven into various forms of infidelity by the recoil of their reasons and instincts from the "horrible decrees," as Calvin designates it. Calvinists, I am glad to say, have done great things and good things for the world. But this they have done certainly not because of the practical tendency of their distinctive doctrines, but in spite of them. They, therefore, deserve the greater credit. But with a better creed they would have accomplished vastly more, and would to-day be entitled to the larger and the greater part of the credit enjoyed by other Churches; *i. e.*, scores of thousands that have been repelled from the Presbyterian Church by the "horrible decrees," and have taken refuge in other organizations less limitarian in creed, would have been members of the Presbyterian Church. Calvinists, of course, at least many of them, think differently, and I very cheerfully "agree to disagree."

"3. As to the *purchase of redemption* (chap. VIII.), there has been a difference of opinion among Calvinists themselves. But we have now to do with only two Confessions, the old and the new. The old makes Christ to have secured by purchase the salvation of those who are sovereignly or unconditionally elected. It says Christ has purchased reconciliation and an everlasting inheritance 'for all those whom the Father hath given unto him.' The new says here that he has purchased those blessings 'for all those who come to

the Father by him'—still making the event to depend on man, and in effect making it *not* to be secured by God in Christ. The same holds in regard to the application of the redemption. The old makes application to be unfailingly coextensive with purchase—'To all those for whom Christ hath purchased redemption he doth certainly and infallibly apply and communicate the same,' etc. The new says, 'Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, has tasted death for every man, and now makes intercession for transgressors; by virtue of which the Holy Spirit is sent to convince of sin, and enable the creature to believe and obey.' No word here of securing that those whom God hath given to Christ shall come to him, but only a suggestion of that 'sufficient grace' given to all who are visited by the gospel, of which our fathers heard much from the Arminians, the Jansenists, and—see Pascal's *Provincial Letters*—from the Jesuits."

According to Calvinists, the impulse to create was a desire on the part of the Almighty to illustrate his glorious grace and glorious justice. This desire was the motive whence proceeded the decree of unconditional election and reprobation, and the decree of the creation and fall of Adam and the imputation of his sin to his posterity. Supralapsarian Calvinists assert that the decree of election and reprobation was prior in the order of nature to the decree of the creation and fall of Adam. Infralapsarian Calvinists deny this, and say that the decree of the creation and fall was prior to the decree of election. This reminds one of tweedledum and tweedledee, but as it is their own fight I will not interfere nor consent to sit as umpire in the case.

The reprobates being guilty of Adam's sin, were already without any supernatural interpositions, in a position to illustrate God's glorious justice by suffering "all the miseries of this life, death itself, and the pains of hell forever." But the elect being also guilty of Adam's sin, were not fit subjects for illustrating God's glorious justice, but could be made so by the vicarious death of the God-man. But while the death of Christ infallibly secured the salvation of the elect, it could not better the prospects of the reprobate, notwithstanding it was efficacious enough to save them all

and a thousandfold more, because it was *limited in intention*—was not designed for them. To save them or permit them to be saved would be to set aside a divine decree.

I am not fascinated with this speculation—like following rudimental sketch better:

God is love. The creative impulse is the desire on the part of the Almighty to propagate, communicate, disseminate his excellencies and felicity. Subservient to this desire, he decreed the creation of man in his own image and likeness; like but not equal to himself, rational, emotional, and free—free in the sense in which he is free, but in a finite sphere, capable of rewards and punishments, and proper subjects of a moral government. But knowing (not decreeing) that man would sin and entail by the divinely-established laws of heredity the curse of apostasy, God decreed to provide a remedy in the mediation of his Son, who should stand as a second representative of the human race, the two representations being not separate and independent of each other, but mutually complementary and the fundamental parts of one decree or plan, so that the adoption of one form of representation was the adoption of the other. The two representations were practically synchronal, and if speculatively, non-synchronal, that in Christ, who was a "lamb slain from the foundation of the world," was precedent. Representation in the first and second Adam is strictly coeval and coequal in extent, but immensely more advantageous in the second than in the first, so that every man, not the elect only, gains far more in Christ than he lost in Adam. Hence, it follows that no human was ever damned or ever can be damned strictly for Adam's sin by any form of transmission or imputation, however deep, dark, or demeritorious that sin may be. Though it may be supplemented by a thousand other actual sins, their combined demerits cannot surpass the efficacy of the blood of the Lamb of God, which is sufficient to take away the sins of the world. If any are lost it is because they reject salvation in Christ. Three grand results are secured by this scheme:

(a) The Divine Father's overflowing love, pity, mercy is

manifested for all men indiscriminately, and not in a stinted, parsimonious measure to a few, who are as demeritorious as the supposed eternal reprobates.

(b) God's "glorious grace" is fully and amazingly illustrated in the fact that he gave his only begotten Son, in whom he is well pleased, to be the *propitiation* for the sins of the whole world; and this glorious grace is largely supplemented by the gracious influence of the Divine Spirit, the divine promises, and the divine providences; a far more liberal and, therefore, far more glorious illustration of sovereign free grace than Calvinistic limitarianism dare to assert.

(c) God's glorious justice is fully illustrated, and with marvelous mingling of love, in this, that the sins of the world were laid upon his Son, who became the legal substitute for mankind; who was made a curse for us; made sin for us, and so fully met the claims of administrative justice that God can "be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." This I do not hesitate to say is a far more glorious illustration of divine justice than Calvinists dare to teach.

These general statements I thought proper to make before entering upon any details concerning Christ's mediatorial work.

Calvinists differ so much among themselves concerning Christ's vicarious work, that I will now notice only that theory set forth in the Westminster Confession. To this theory I object for three reasons: (1) Because it proceeds on a false principle. (2) It is not sufficiently discriminated. (3) It is too limited in its intention.

1. It proceeds on a commercial plan—is simply a bargain. The Father gives a definite number of souls for a definite amount of blood and suffering—a very human-like transaction. This assumes that men are redeemed as individuals and not as species.

Now Christ has only a limited amount of blood to shed and, as human, only a limited capacity of sufferings. How much he could endure as God-man or how much efficacy his divinity could impart to the sufferings of his humanity, we cannot know. But we do know that his mere human suffer-



ing, not supplemented by the union of the human with the divine, could not atone for even one soul.

The presumption, therefore, is, if there had been but one soul to redeem it would have required exactly the same degree and kind of suffering that he actually endured for all the elect or for all the world. This suffering is supposed to be infinite or well nigh so. But the number even of the elect is presumably well nigh infinite. It, however, follows on this plan that well nigh an infinite number of deaths, each of well nigh infinite sufferings, were concentrated in the one death of Christ. The theory approximates the extravagance, not to say absurdity, of the idea of an infinite number of infinities.

I suggest a simpler and more intelligible hypothesis, viz., that as the first sin was sufficient to lay the ground of universal condemnation, so the suffering necessary to atone for that one sin is sufficient to lay the ground of universal justification. I suggest, but am unwilling to dogmatize on so difficult a subject.

2. Westminster theology fails to properly discriminate between propitiation and reconciliation. These terms in the New Testament are never confounded, but sharply discriminated. Westminster theology, on the contrary, makes them identical, or at least inseparable. It is certainly true, there can be no reconciliation without propitiation, but it does not thence follow that there can be no propitiation without reconciliation. This can be readily shown from the admission of Calvinists themselves. Propitiation is full satisfaction rendered to divine justice for the sins of those for whom it is made. If reconciliation is legally involved in propitiation, then it ought to intervene at the earliest possible moment, even at or before birth. According to the theory, all suffering is penal, but the elect infant of a single day often suffers, and in suffering pays a part of the penalty of sin, which has already been fully paid in Christ's propitiation. This is certainly an injustice. But the elect infant may live on in sin for a century, all the while suffering the penalty of its sins, adding sin to sin and suffering to suffering; its subsequent sins being punishments for its former

sins; hating God and suffering remorse mingled with despair; its state a very hell on earth, yet having from the first moment of its existence a legal right, by the propitiation of Christ, to all rights, lights, and benefits of full reconciliation to God; Christ, also, all this time being denied the pleasure of seeing the release of the captive soul for whom he died. This would be an injustice in the divine administration, an injustice to Christ, and an injustice to the grown-up child. This is no imaginary but real case, if reconciliation is legally included in propitiation or infallibly flows from it. But if the reconciliation for those for whom propitiation has been made for one century may be deferred, why not for two, or forever? To delay it one hour is really an injustice, though not so great a one as to delay it forever. [That part of this argument that relates to physical suffering may be retorted upon anti-Calvinists who teach that all suffering is penal.] The theory at this point is sadly in want of some crotchets or some kind of supplementation.

The admitted fact that the unreconciled elect "*sic*" may suffer the penalty of their own sins, already propitiated, for indefinite periods, furnishes logical ground for the faith that reconciliation is not an infallible but only a possible result of propitiation.

Christ is the propitiation but he is not the reconciliation, but only the ground, the medium of reconciliation. Calvinists and a large school of Universalists are equally alike at fault in asserting that all for whom Christ died will infallibly be saved.

3. In regard to the atonement (I use the word in its technical, not etymological sense), Calvinists are in hopeless conflict among themselves. Some assert its infinite sufficiency but limit in design. Some say it is sufficient for all and intended for all, but save their limitarianism by restricting divine influence. Some seem to hold to limitation both in measure and intention. This last is, I think, the most self-consistent hypothesis. But after all, it is only a choice between Scylla and Charybdis.

The compilers of the new Confession excised from the

old its partial propitiation, and in so doing, I think, did God service.

The "confessors" march under a banner incrimed with three grand universalities and one grand possibility: The love of the universal Father *to all*; the propitiation of the Divine Son *for all*; The power of the Divine Spirit *upon all*; the possibility of reconciliation *to all*.

The facts thrill my very soul with gratitude and spread the radiance of a Heaven-given hope all around me. I can say with an earnest, full soul to every dying sinner, Jesus died for *you*; "believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved;" and have no fears that I have uttered a falsehood.

"4. The remaining three of the five points regarding conversion, faith, and perseverance are represented by the expression, *efficacious grace*. The old Confession (chap. x.) says: 'All those whom God has predestinated unto life, and those only, he is pleased . . . effectually to call.' The new says: 'All those whom God calls, and who obey the call, he is pleased . . . to bring out of that state of sin in which they are by nature.' Both the old and new represent God as proceeding exceptionally to salvation in the exceptional cases of infants who die in infancy, and of others who are 'naturally incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the Word.' But the old says that in those exceptional cases, too, salvation is traceable to sovereign election: while the new says: 'All infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ, . . . so also are others who have never had the exercise of reason.' The why it has been thought necessary to 'expunge' the sovereign election in those cases does not appear. Again, the old Confession (chap. xiv.), under the heading of 'Saving Faith,' speaks of the 'grace of faith, whereby the elect are enabled to believe,' etc. Where the new under the heading of 'Saving Grace,' speaks of the 'grace of faith, whereby sinners are united to Christ,' etc., again 'expunging' the discriminating or electing grace of God, as cause of faith. Once more the old (chap. xvii.) says: 'They whom God hath . . . effectually called . . . can neither totally nor finally fall away from the state of grace;'

where the new says regarding those 'whom God hath justified and sanctified' 'the *truly* (*sic.*) regenerated soul will never totally nor finally fall away.' And where the old says: 'This perseverance of the saints depends not upon their own free will, but upon the immutability of the decree of election, flowing from the free and unchangeable love of God the Father,' etc., the new says: 'This perseverance depends on the unchangeable love and power of God,' etc.; where again the declaration of sovereignty of grace is 'expunged.'

"5 Correlative to sovereign efficaciousness on God's part, is *moral impotency, total inability*, on man's part, by nature, as fallen. Regarding the source of this inability the old Confession (chap. VI.) says: 'They (our first parents) being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this (their first) sin was imputed and their corruption was transmitted to their posterity; thus making the imputation of Adam's first sin the legal reason of corruption to mankind.' The new slurs over this imputation, saying only, 'by their sin all were made sinners;' though the new speaks like the old regarding the imputation of Christ's righteousness for our justification. But the great question here has reference to the amount of the corruption, the extent of the inability. As to this, the old Confession says that man, as fallen, 'is not able by his own strength to convert himself, or to prepare himself thereunto,' (*i. e.*, for conversion). The new says, 'or prepare himself thereunto without divine aid.' The addition here, 'without divine aid,' might in other circumstances, be regarded as merely pleonastic. But here the intelligent theologian will perceive that it is fitted and intended to suggest the notion of 'sufficient grace'—given to all who are visited by the gospel—beyond which, common to all, the event of conversion depends wholly on the will of this and that man, *not* on the sovereignly efficacious and discriminating grace of God.

"It is to this that we return. The new Confession throughout the main ramifications of relative doctrine is un-Calvinistic and anti-Calvinistic: it is completely Arminian. And this it is deliberately and consciously, thus presenting a very different case from the preaching of some Calvinists, who, wisely or unwisely, in their anxiety to present the humaner

aspects of the Gospel, shrink from setting forth boldly the 'diviner' aspects represented by the expression, 'sovereignty of grace,' although the belief to that sovereignty should pervade all their ministrations, especially their prayers, and mould their hearts and lives."

In reference to the remainder of Prof. MacGregor's article, I will submit a few general statements on depravity, conversion, and perseverance.

I. Prof. MacGregor seems afflicted somewhat by what he deems the ill treatment of his favorite scheme of depravity.

The compilers of the new Confession very discreetly declined to say what they did not know to be true. If what the old Confession asserts is true, then what the new asserts is certainly true, is not, therefore, obnoxious to adverse criticism. Calvinists assert different and contradictory theories on imputation, but cannot agree among themselves which is true, whether that of preëxistentism, or that of identity between Adam and his posterity, or that of federal headship. They cannot agree for the simple reason that none of their theories can be proved by metaphysics, or by the Bible.

The new Confession asserts substantially all that is known on the subject, viz.: That Adam sinned, and by his sin all descending from him are made or become sinners, and are born in a state of corruption and spiritual death, whence results actual sins and condemnation. No agency is here asserted except natural headship, and the laws of heredity. This method of statement is, I think, in harmony with every text in the Bible bearing on the subject, and is easy of comprehension. As to depravity, *total* depravity, Cumberland Presbyterians assert it and preach it as strong as Calvinists themselves, but they do not choose to say all the equivocal things Calvinists sometimes say about it. All know that infants are depraved, born in sin, going astray from God, and need regeneration in order to be saved. But who knows whether they are guilty in God's esteem in such a sense as to deserve eternal death? The revealed will of God has made no utterance on the subject. But who knows that they are in a *justified* state? God has given no information on the subject, and he that affirms either their justification or con-



demnation shows himself wise above what is written. But of what theoretical or practical value is the question of imputed guilt? I answer emphatically, it is of no value to any theological scheme, except such as embrace the doctrine of unconditional election and reprobation. For if infants are condemned and deserve eternal death, our Heavenly Father sees well to it that they never get their deserts when they die. If they are innocent or justified in any sense, we have reason to believe that they are promptly relieved of their corrupt nature when they die.

In the partially civilized state of Christendom in the dark ages, and in ages not quite so dark, some men—good men, too—did believe in infant perdition. But that doctrine, like a cowardly miscreant, fades before the increasing light of Christian civilization. Though it is a logical correlate of Calvinism, and is rather more than intimated in the old Confession, yet Calvinists in America are not willing to avow it. In proof of this, the General Assembly in 1877, at the instance of Dr. Vandyke, the moderator, took a rising vote on the subject, and the whole six or seven hundred members repudiated the idea of infant perdition. I presume that act crushed the life out of the thing in America, and sleeping infants since that event have been disturbed by no horrid dreams of perdition on account of Adam's sin. How it is in good old Scotland, I am not so sure. I know there are some bright spots there, but I am not certain if there are not some dark ones, too—*theologically dark*, I mean. Brother MacGregor neither explicitly affirms or denies, but *looks* a little guilty. Noting the new Confession in reference to infants and idiots, he says: "Why it has been thought necessary to 'expunge' the sovereign election in those cases does not appear." I hope he is not guilty of the barbarian relic. But if any Presbyterian preachers in Scotland who preach infant perdition will come to the United States, they will soon learn that discretion is the better part of valor, and seal their lips on that subject.

I repeat, imputation as held by Calvinists, is of no theoretical or practical value to any scheme of theology that rejects unconditional election and reprobation. But to the Westminster theory it is of immense value. It is the key-stone

to the colossal Calvinistic arch, of which we have heard so much boasting. If it can be made clear that infants are so far guilty of Adam's sin as to deserve all the miseries of this life, death itself, and the pains of hell forever, then God's honor and justice cannot be implicated in their destruction. However great their misery may be, they deserve it all, for somehow (Calvinists cannot agree how) Adam's sin is their sin, and justice requires their everlasting punishment, and none have the right to complain of their lot, it being the just reward of a fault or sin somehow their own. Hence, if God sends all to perdition it is just, and his throne is untarnished. But if he elects to save some, it illustrates his glorious grace and does no injustice to the others. Here, then, we have the vindication of Calvin's *horrible decree* of election and reprobation. If He damns all it is just: if he elects to save some it is grace, and the unelected have no ground to complain of injustice or partiality. The motive for the decree seems to be the allwise God finds himself in a sort of strait for the want of means to illustrate his glorious grace and his glorious justice, and thus provides the desideratum quite to the advantage of the elect, but somewhat to the disadvantage of the reprobate. Thus the decree of election and reprobation is fully and triumphantly justified by imputation. But what justifies imputation? for that in itself is an evil, a curse in some respects, more so than perdition itself (such a perdition as those could endure who have no consciousness of personal guilt). Ah, that's the hard question Augustine, Anslem, Calvin, the Westminster Assembly and hundreds of others answer. Identity of all mankind with Adam in his first sin; that when he sinned all humanity was comprised in him, consequently his voluntary sin was the voluntary and actual sin of all humanity. But all men are simply individualizations of this common humanity, that voluntarily ate the interdicted fruit. Thus the individual Adam corrupted the whole human nature when it was all resident in him, and now this corrupted humanity corrupts all men, who are only its individualizations. In this way every man voluntarily sinned. Here we have the figment of realism, in all its fully developed proportions, made the key-stone in a great theological arch. What is it

worth? Not a bauble, thousands of Calvinists being judge. Others justify imputation by the myth of federal headship, sometimes combined with natural headship, or the laws of heredity, or "ordinary generations."

This is the Princeton theory, and Dr. Charles Hodge, one of the purest men and ripest scholars the American Church has yet produced, may be regarded as its principal champion. Though less ridiculous than the Augustinian or Anselmic theory, the argument cannot stand the test of searching criticism, or of the Bible. It is simply unjust to men and dishonoring to God. There is no method by which the Augustinian imputation can be justified. In my humble judgment, at least, none of the arguments ever yet adduced are sufficient to support it. But if we knock out imputation; then there is no way to justify the decree of election and reprobation, and the famous arch must tumble to the ground. There will remain no other method of justifying the divine administration in causing the corruptions of Adam's sin to be transmitted to his posterity, so as to involve in a state of helpless sin and spiritual death, but by full complementary representation in Christ, as indicated above.

II. In reference to conversion I will say but little. Calvinists are strictly monergists. Logical consistency requires this. Cumberland Presbyterians are avowedly synergists in the sense that the human will is active in following where the Divine Spirit leads. All human inabilities are overcome, so that the mind can voluntarily accept what God offers, and also reject what God offers, so that if saved, man is saved by grace; if lost, it is by voluntary rejection of Christ. They, therefore, reject the doctrine of "irresistible grace," which they deem one of the vices of Westminsterism. I believe as fully in salvation by grace as any Calvinist does, but "it is by faith that it might be by grace through faith." Salvation is conditional upon faith. The Bible is full of this doctrine. But faith does not merit what is conditional upon it. The starving beggar who receives a morsel of bread by a benefactor merits nothing by receiving it voluntarily, no more than he would if the bread were forced into his mouth, without his consent. The bread is graciously offered: if the

beggar receives it he is saved from starvation; if he rejects it he is the voluntary author of his own death. So with the starving sinner. We do not hold that men are saved because of faith, but through faith.

I have before me a recent editorial from a Calvinistic paper, that says: "Cumberland Presbyterians hold an election not unto good works, but because of them," and when asked to prove the statement says: "If faith and repentance must precede election, they are the antecedent conditions, which is the same thing as saying that election is because of good works." Elsewhere in the same article faith and good works are made identical. Where did this editor get his theology? Certainly not from the Bible. Paul attempted to teach him, but of course could not give him the ability, either natural or moral, to comprehend it—that faith is not work and work is not faith. He everywhere sets in opposition grace and works. But he also explicitly asserts faith to be the necessary condition of saving grace, and then antagonizes faith and works: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."—Faith and works, the exact opposites. Therefore, it is of faith that it might be by grace—grace conditional by faith. "For by grace are ye saved through faith. . . . Not of works, lest any man should boast." Grace conditional upon faith and set in opposition to works. Will Calvinists never learn that faith is not works?

Synergism rightly defined is in as strict harmony with the doctrine of salvation by grace as any scheme of Monergism whatever.

Prof. MacGregor seems quite disquieted because the new Confession excludes the decree of election as the basis of perseverance. He ought not, however, to scold us much for this, because having excinded the Calvinistic theory of decrees from the third chapter, consistency required the compilers to reject it from the seventeenth chapter. But if it will be any relief to the theological sensibilities of Prof. MacGregor, I would be willing to supplement our ground of perseverance by saying it rests on a divine decree, and as one decree is presumed to be as trustworthy as another, and as I know

nothing of the *secret decrees* (if anybody does they are not secret), I will select one from the Book of *revealed decrees*. The following, I hope, will be satisfactory: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life." Prof. MacGregor says of the new Confession, that it is "un-Calvinistic and anti-Calvinistic: it is completely Arminian."

It is here pertinent to state that it has been a thousand times asserted and reasserted by Presbyterian preachers in this country, that the only difference between the old and new Confession is in regard to the education of the ministry. What has our stiff Scotch brother to say to that?

Again, I have often heard Presbyterians in their sermons go further in the direction of Pelagianism than I dare go. What does he think of that?

Again, Presbyterian preachers in this country preach substantially the doctrines of the new Confession, but with such obscurity or ambiguity of terminology as to be able to hold on to their limitarianism. What does our trans-Atlantic brother think of that? I have known Presbyterians to say that the doctrines of the two Confessions were the same: that the new said only what the old meant. What has the brother to say to that? I deem it of very minute consequence whether the new Confession agrees with Calvinism or Arminianism, or any other humanism. A vastly more important question is: Does it agree with God's Holy Word?

S. G. BURNET.



## ART. IX.—NOTES.

BY PROF. FOSTER.

## CHRIST'S MIRACLES.

THE discussion of the miracles of Christ is not antiquated and will never be, especially in its doctrinal and homiletical aspects. But everybody does not stop here. There have always been those, and there are still those, who seek to understand *how* Christ performed his "mighty works," and because they fail to understand they would feign disbelieve. There is no possible advantage, so far as we can see, in trying to understand how Christ wrought miracles. They were done by the word of his power, and that is the sum and substance of all anybody knows about it. But this does not render them any the less believable as facts. Surely not. Who doubts that the sun attracts the earth and that the earth attracts bodies toward its center? No one. And yet no one understands how. Newton and other philosophers used to conjecture how, but they gave it up long ago. In order that a thing may be believable, it is not necessary that the mind should be able to grasp the connection between the cause and its effect. If we refuse to believe that Christ wrought miracles merely because we cannot understand *how* or by what *means* he wrought them, we must, on the same principle, refuse to believe a great many very obvious facts, and this consideration is certainly entitled to more weight than is usually awarded it by skeptics. But, after all, the word "miracle," as it is popularly understood, is not a New Testament word. The evangelists do not use it. It found its way into our English gospels from the Vulgate *miraculum*. The evangelists use the better words "signs," "mighty works," "powers," or, as the latter word more correctly means, the outward manifestation of an inward power or faculty to do that which man could not do. The word *miraculum* signifies that which excites wonder, but Christ's

"miracles" were not mere excitants of wonder. They were "mighty works," done in part—at least so far as his contemporaries were concerned—as an evidence of his mission. We have no right to say that they were violations of the laws of nature. They were natural and ordinary to Christ, as the Dean of Canterbury truly said years ago. The statement deserves wider currency and greater emphasis than it has yet received. The miracles of Christ were natural and ordinary to him, as much so as the power of speech is to man, because they lay entirely within the limit of his power. They were "*miracles*" only as viewed from the human standpoint. The horse hears its master talking. From the standpoint of the horse the talking is a miracle, because it lies entirely without the natural limit of the horse's power. But man does not look upon it as a miracle. So the evangelists write as coolly and unsuspiciously about the miracles of Christ as if it were as easy and natural for him to do mighty works as it is for a man to talk. *They* view them from the divine stand-point and not from the human. If a mere man had done what they saw Christ do, they would have regarded it as something to be wondered at. But in this sense the evangelists did no more believe in miracles than did David Hume. Of course it would be "contrary to all human experience," and a thing not to be believed for an instant, that a mere man could restore life to a dead body or command the winds and the billows into sudden stillness. But Christ did it, and when the evangelist stood before Lazarus' tomb and saw the thing done, he was doubtless astonished; but when he wrote his gospel he was not astonished at all, for he had long ago come to a full recognition of Christ's divinity.

It is true that all this does presuppose the omnipotence, and hence the divinity of Christ. But we who live in these later centuries have a right to do that. We have an argument which the twelve disciples had not, and that argument, the best of all arguments, perhaps, is Christianity itself. It, the standing miracle of the ages, becomes an enigma, of which we cannot rid ourselves unless we postulate the divinity of Christ. We cannot explain Christianity, neither

in itself nor in its fruits, on any other supposition. No impostor, no mere human genius, whether impostor or not, could have invented it. The history of the world from the beginning until now makes that abundantly evident. It is still more abundantly true that no mere human genius could have sent it sweeping, with an ever-accelerating force, through the ages. Mohammedanism had the sword to recommend it, and other religions have had the authority of the state, but what had Christianity? Nothing but itself.

But if Christ was divine, he was omnipotent; and if he was omnipotent, he could do anything. Hence, he could perform such mighty works as from the human stand-point are called miracles; and if he *could*, there is very strong antecedent probability that he *would*; hence we believe that he *did*. Certainly we who live in these later days and see what Christianity has done and is still doing, can well afford to believe in miracles for Christ's sake, rather than in Christ because of the miracles; or, in other words, we can well afford to let Christianity testify in behalf of miracles rather than miracles in behalf of Christianity. But after all, the matter practically amounts simply to this: If one man believes and another does not, the difference is due mainly to the fact that one man prays and the other doesn't. If you doubt and do not wish to believe, it is hardly worth your while to read any number of volumes of argument. If you doubt and sincerely wish to believe, you will not doubt long, whether you read many volumes or not. The best *preparation* for belief is prayer, and he who writes this does not believe in unanswered prayers. Let him apply, then, to this subject this specimen of practical logic from the mouth of Jesus of Nazareth, for he was a splendid logician, after all, even if he was once *the Nazarene*: "If any one should desire to do his will, he will know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." "Put your hand resolutely to the discharge of such duties as you know to be duties, and it will not be long before the evidence of experience will come to the help of your logic, and put whatever doubts you may have to flight."

## SPURIOUS ZEAL.

There ought to be not only zeal, but a large degree of zeal, on the part of the servants of the Great Husbandman. It argues love and a spirit of devotion to his service, without which not much can be accomplished. But unfortunately zeal may degenerate into either a narrow-minded or a broad-minded fanaticism, which is one of the very worst enemies the Church has to combat. Here the exceeding craftiness of the enemy in the parable of the wheat and the tares reveals itself, for he can oftentimes accomplish more evil by calling forth a false zeal on the part of the disciples than he can by stealthily sowing the tares. Therefore it is that the Master in his wiser wisdom and intenser regard for the welfare of the children of the kingdom must sometimes say, "Nay, lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them." One grain of wheat (one sincere, humble Christian) is worth far more in the sight of the Master than a thousand tares, and for the sake of destroying the one prematurely, he would not injure a single grain of the other. "Let both grow together until the harvest." Then, when the seeds of both are ripe, and the difference between them may be clearly discerned, I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." Thereby is breathed into the gospel the spirit not only of a proper religious discipline, but also of a proper religious toleration. It is for us always to recognize the distinction between the visible and the invisible Church, but it is not for us to separate between them, for the simple reason that in very many instances our eyes would not be keen enough to distinguish the tare from the wheat. Under the gospel dispensation "the law proceeds from Zion" (Mich. iv.) and not from Sinai, which fact it might be well enough for us to remember in all cases of discipline. Love is the strongest force in all the universe, and the gospel is its highest, and purest, and most abundant expression. By love God will save the world, and by it

must the pastor in every case reclaim the wayward member of his fold.

But suppose that some one who is not a Christian taunts you with the statement that there is as much corruption in the Church as there is out of it; that this or that member is most probably no better than he is; that this or that officer has been known to do more than one thing that he would not think of doing, do not be unduly distressed about it. Such words are rarely honest words and rarely mean any thing good. Whenever a man begins "to thank God" in one way or another that *he* "is not as that publican," it is a bad sign; and whenever he begins to make "that publican" an excuse for his own neglect of duty it is no better one. But however provoking sin in the Church may be to you, be patient. The harvest-time will come. Do not suffer envious or captious critics to make a tool of you. Do not suffer the crafty enemy to play upon your conscience and drive you into indiscretions. Remember, it is the tares among the wheat and not the wheat among the tares. It is sin in the Church and not the Church in sin. And an enemy sowed the seed. It was not you. They must grow together until they are ripe, now and always, as they did in the parable. If you attempt to separate them before their time, and set up a little Church of your own, you sin. You forget also that there is already much evil even in yourself, as well as in the Church of which you complain. Remember, also, that those persons represented by the tares may be benefitted by association with the wheat; for the kingdom of heaven is also "like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." Perhaps for this reason, then, it might be well to let them stand together until the harvest. Do all you can in whatever capacity you may labor, to exterminate sin from among men, but make no effort to exterminate the sinner, lest perchance you might exterminate yourself. Be patient. Do not anticipate the wisdom nor the time of the Master.

#### CATECHETICS.

"I do not understand," says Brakel, "how a teacher (or



pastor) can die in peace, who has not been diligent in the work of catechising." What is catechising? It is, in brief, leading the little ones to Christ, and nurturing them continually with spiritual food "convenient for them." We, as Presbyterians, believe in infant baptism. (I, for one, believe in it with all my heart—the baptism of the children of Christian parents.) Why is it, then, that all our pastors without exception do not see to it that all the children of their folds are baptized in infancy, and so soon as the child is old enough, follow up the baptism with the diligent work of catechising? Are they not *bishops*? And is it not a bishop's *duty to see*? That is what the word means—an overseer. But how often is it the case that the new convert must be informed by his mother, or some other person, that he was baptized in infancy, for fear that now on "joining the Church" he may be baptized a second time? That is a proof of very culpable neglect on the part of some one, and furnishes some ground for the charge sometimes made that the baptism of an unconscious and irresponsible infant is a farce. What is it, indeed, but a farce when the subsequent duty of leading the little one to Christ, and nurturing it continually with suitable spiritual food, is so grossly neglected? Whose duty is it? Very largely the parents', of course, but by no means exclusively. It belongs to the pastor also, and no pastor can neglect it with impunity. Call to mind again the saying of Brakel: "I do not understand how a teacher can die in peace who has not been diligent in the work of catechising." How can he even *expect* to die in peace? The idea of keeping a child away from Christ! Call to mind, also, this other saying of Borger: "He who scatters the seed of Christianity in the heart of a child trains a plant for the Paradise of God." And shall it be said that the reason why there are not more plants in the Paradise of God is because you, as a pastor, have scattered no seed of Christianity in the heart of the children? No, it shall not be said, if you are a wise pastor, for no truly wise man, however learned he may be, will regard children and young people as unworthy of his attention. Baptize the children. Baptize them into the Church,

side by side with their Christian parents. Baptize them according to the letter and spirit of the formula. Follow up this act of baptism ever thereafter with watchful and loving nurture, and it will not be half so difficult to make converted and useful Christians out of the wayward as it otherwise would be. "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these? . . . Yea Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith unto him, Feed my lambs."

The lambs in years and the lambs in Christian experience and strength, nurture them diligently and tenderly, and great shall be the reward.

#### REVIVALS.

The reports of our pastors and evangelists as published in the church papers during the past twelve months are decidedly encouraging. It may be true, and doubtless it is, that the Church cannot do the work whereunto it is called without its religious literature and its several schools. But it is equally true that in the faithful and efficient pastor and evangelist lie the fundamental elements of all Church progress. When we hear that our institutions of learning are flourishing we should rejoice. When we hear that our publication interests are in good condition we should rejoice. But should we not rejoice most of all when we hear that daily such as shall be saved are being added unto the Church? The Cumberland Presbyterian Church was born amidst one of the most wonderful revivals this continent has ever known, and I, for one, heartily hope that the spirit of its childhood may never depart from it. If the Church fails to be instrumental in saving souls it fails to fulfil its proper mission, however compact may be its organization, and however well-working its social, literary, and educational machinery. But "to save souls" means something more than simply to convert them from a "state of nature" to a "state of grace," a fact, however, which is not always borne sufficiently in mind. What is the word that expresses the most intimate relation of the preacher to the people? It is *pastor*. And what does "pastor" mean? It means *shepherd*. What is the duty of the shepherd? To feed "my lambs"

and "my sheep," says the Master. The first step in saving souls is to bring them into the fold, and the second is to *keep* them there and feed them according to their several conditions, not once a month or once a week merely, but constantly, watchfully, tenderly. We believe in "the perseverance of the saints." But lambs, or, to drop the metaphor, young converts, are not saints. Neither are all the old members. They cannot persevere very well, I mean, without pastoral help and encouragement. It will not do to let them alone. They will get themselves into trouble and the shepherd also. But are there not those who think that all the work is done when the first of the above-mentioned steps is taken? I do not know, but I do know that there are those who act as if they thought so, which is even worse. The name is enrolled on the church list as a fresh convert, whether old in years or not, and in many instances that is well nigh the last of it. The poor thing flounders along the best it can without any shepherd's care, and too often flounders out of the fold into the world—darkness and brushes. What is this but a negative, though still effective, way of scattering the sheep? And what saith the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah the prophet? "Woe be unto the pastors that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture! saith the Lord. . . . Ye have scattered my flock and have not visited them: behold I will visit upon you the evil of your doings, saith the Lord." No man, learned or unlearned, has the smallest right to call himself one of the Lord's pastors, or to permit any one else to so call him, unless he understands his Master's business. If he does not understand at the start, he ought to learn, and he ought not to be long about it, for some poor lamb might die on his hands or stray away from the fold. Nor has any pastor the smallest right to suffer his timidity, or other defect of character, to interfere with the faithful fulfilment of the functions of his office. Moses had a stammering tongue, but the plea would not do. Jeremiah said, "Ah, Lord God! behold I cannot speak; for I am a child." But the Lord answered and said, "Say not, I am a child; for thou shalt go to all I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee

thou shalt speak." The pastor, indeed, should as nearly as possible be acquainted with the spiritual pulse of every member of his fold, whether their names be enrolled as converts on his list or not, and in the smaller pastorates it is *wholly* possible. He can do this without interfering with the proper freedom of either the lambs or the sheep. He can do it intelligibly and affectionately, and without being unduly obtrusive.

But what has this to do with "Revivals?" Very much; for after all, there is a sense in which the revival is a thing to be lamented, not in itself, indeed, but in the cause that renders it necessary. And what is that cause but a preceding coldness or lukewarmness on the part of the church, including the pastor also? But there is no good reason—none at all—why this state of things should ever be. Let the pastor and his charge be always in good spiritual health, and it may be truly said that they will always have something of a revival among them, however unusually abundant the occasional outpourings may be.

## ART. X.—THE ELDERSHIP.

THE question of the eligibility of the ruling elder to the office of moderator was referred to the Judiciary Committee by the last General Assembly of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. The committee reported in favor of the eligibility of ruling elders, and the report, after being discussed, was referred to the next General Assembly, which is to convene in Austin, Texas, next May. Some interest is manifested upon the subject, and different views entertained by those who have looked into the question.

As it may be a matter of interest to our readers, we take the liberty of making some extracts from the discussion of the subject in the second General Council of the Presbyterian Alliance at Philadelphia last year.

The Rev. C. H. Read, D.D., of Richmond, Va., read a lengthy and excellent paper upon the subject of ruling elders, upon which there was a very interesting discussion by many able members of the body.

The Hon. James Dawson, of Washington, Iowa: "I want not to criticise anything that has been said on the ruling elder, but to emphasize the importance of his position as fixed by the Presbyterian Church and as authorized by the divine institution. All elders are ruling elders, but all are not teaching elders. The ruling elder stands, so far as ruling is concerned, on a perfect level with the minister in everything, except the Word and doctrine. We do not as elders, I fear, feel this to be so important a matter as it is, while the purity, the peace, and the prosperity of the Church lie upon the ruling eldership equally with the teaching elders. It is said that the elder that rules well is worthy of double honor, especially he that labors in word and doctrine. No higher duty can be placed upon a man upon this earth than to be the teaching ambassador of Jesus Christ, and the next position he can be placed in is to rule in the house of God.



If we felt the importance of this, our churches would be likely to prosper more. An elder has a great deal to do in the church, and a young minister in a congregation never had a better instrumentality to help him up to honor and dignity than a faithful, prudent corps of elders as his assistants. Faithfulness is required on the part of the elder as well as on the part of the minister for the purity and prosperity of the Church of Jesus Christ. The prophet places the faithful teacher of his word at the head and the unfaithful at the tail of creation. Faithfulness is required, and it is equally required of the eldership."

James Croil, of Montreal, Canada: "Prof. Wilson, who made reference to the eldership yesterday, went a great deal further than, I think, a great body of the elders want to be carried. I do not think we claim for ourselves equal power with the minister in any regard. If I understand Prof. Wilson, he made that statement. The other gentleman who read a paper upon the subject, did not go far enough for my fancy. He just exactly stopped where I think he ought to have begun. He did not tell anything about the modern elder, and that is what we are all very much concerned about. I can only say a few disjointed sentences on the subject. It is a very large and important subject. I hope to elicit from other members of this Council some very useful and valuable information. I ask this question, Is an elder a presbyter? If he is a presbyter, then he is a bishop. If he is a bishop, then he is a teaching elder, surely. How many kinds of bishops are there in the New Testament? I want to get an answer to these questions. If you ask me, Is an elder a presbyter? I say, Yes, and say, No. I say, Theoretically he is a presbyter; and I say, Practically, after an experience of thirty years in the eldership, he is not. I say, Yes, he is a presbyter. But to what extent does this entitle him to rights and privileges in the Presbytery? O, you say, he may sit and vote and deliberate in the Presbytery. Perhaps he may to a certain extent. Take my own case. I am one of eighteen elders, and I am to be selected as a delegate to the Presbytery; but I am only one of eighteen, and only stand one-eighteenth of a chance to be so selected.

It takes nine tailors to make a man, but in this case it takes eighteen elders to make a presbyter. You say he may take part in the prayer-meeting, he may visit the sick; so may any other Christian man, I presume. O, you say, but he must assist the minister in dispensing the ordinance of the Supper. I suppose if there was a lack of elders, any pious man in the congregation may be asked to do that. You say, O, he may be even asked to take up the collection. I submit, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly competent for the door-keeper to do that. So I do not see that we gain very much in our standing by these qualifications. I am speaking of the modern elder, not the scriptural elder. I want to be told to which class I belong. You say an elder is a presbyter. I go to Presbytery. Did any one ever conceive it to be a proper thing to ask an elder to take the moderator's place in the Presbytery? It has never been done in point of fact, at least I never knew of it in Canada. I am merely stating that as one of the disabilities of the eldership. Here is a point that no one will dispute: Who is it that ordains the ministers? Is it a Presbytery? Yes. All the Presbyters? No. If an elder should come forward and attempt it, it would be said, Hands off; you should not put your hands on the minister's head! I have nothing to do with the ordination of ministers. Therefore, I am not a presbyter to that extent. What is the church session? That is meeting of the elders, with the teaching elder in the chair. It must be well known to the members of this Council that no such meeting of a church session can possibly be held unless the minister is in the chair. Is not that a disability? I cannot occupy the chair, even in the absence of the minister, if there shall be no church session till dooms-day. I only show that we are not Presbyters, as some of you will make us to be. It follows that the modern elder is not the scriptural elder. I do not see that there is any way of getting out of the difficulty, but I think if such be the case it is just as well to let us know what a modern elder ought to be. The remedy for this is either to reduce the pretensions of the eldership, or educate the elders to a more efficient discharge of their duties."

Henry Day, Esq., of New York: "I think this is a contest between the lay elders; and I think the lay elders ought to settle it. The difficulty with our Canadian brother (Mr. Croil) was, I imagine, that his experience was not exactly like the experience in some other countries. The difficulty seemed to be that he did not assert his right like a freeman. It may be because he lives in the Dominion of Canada. If he lived the United States he would feel that he could be a moderator and a teaching elder; because it is certain that even a lay elder can be moderator in our General Assembly, and some day that will happen. I would not be surprised if Judge Strong should be chosen if he should attend the next General Assembly. It strikes me that this system of lay elders is one of the grandest things in the polity of the Presbyterian Church. It is natural law and the natural method of government, the very government that you would all resort to if you were thrown upon a desert island and obliged to make a government for yourselves. The civil government would be made exactly in this way, by a representative from among the people, and by some one man to represent the authority in the highest sphere. That is Presbyterianism, and that is scriptural government. It is one of the proofs that it is a divine government that it is natural; that it secures every man's rights. . . .

"We are all equals, as I understand. Our Canadian brother says we are not. We do not do the same thing, but we are all equal in authority; and when we come to vote we have each as much power as the other."

## ART. XI.—LITERARY NOTICES.

A MANUAL OF CLASSICAL LITERATURE, Comprising Biographical and Critical Notices of the Principal Greek and Roman Authors, with Illustrative Extracts from their Works; also a Brief Survey of the Rise and Progress of the Various Forms of Literature, with Descriptions of the Minor Authors, by Charles Morris. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1880.

A great many people are able to tell when a thing is needed both for their own and the public good, but they never exert themselves to produce the thing needed further than to give minute and extensive directions. Of course this amounts to but very little. There are others, however, who set themselves to find wherein the trouble lies, and, if possible, remedy it. We think we can very justly place our author in the latter class, for he recognized the fact that owing to the great change in regard to education so little attention is paid to the study of the ancient languages, both in our universities and high schools, as to render the student unable to become thoroughly acquainted with the classic authors and to read them readily in the original. There have been many translations and critical treatises written which have been of great assistance, but they are too long and not adapted to general use. Such an objection could not be raised to our present book. The matter is presented in a condensed form, yet extensive enough to give one a good idea of the ancient literature. Unlike most books of the kind, it is not partial in the selection of character, but notices alike such as are worthy of note.

Our book is divided into two parts. Part I. treats of the "Literature of Greece." This embraces a "Critical and Historical Introduction," with a list of the epic and lyric poets. Here we find the distinction between epic and lyric poetry very accurately drawn, defining each and giving a sketch of the principal writers under each. Our author

thinks the drama rather took the place of lyric poetry, and that the sudden decline of the latter was due in a great measure to the love and attention the Athenians gave to the former. The two, though closely related, could not exist at the same time. The change, however, was for the better, for it indicated progress. Here we learn wherein the ancient drama differs from the modern. In middle and new comedy, we learn that though the ancients, not unlike modern writers, mixed the comic along with the serious, some of their most renowned writers turned all their attention to this division of literature. The progress of Grecian history is clearly defined, and three of its most noted representatives, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophen, are reviewed, their style of writing and plan of their works being set forth in a manner calculated to inspire a love for this character of literature in the mind of every student. Our author gives a good account of the origin and progress of philosophy and the theories of the different schools, with a sketch of the founders and writers of each. Oratory with the Greeks seems to have been placed on a higher plane than we find it at the present day. They seemed to have a natural love for it, and left nothing unstudied that would give them assistance in their art.

Under the head of Greek Anthology, after a history of the decay of the different ages of poetry, are given extracts which are as varied in style as they are beautiful in sentiment, illustrating not only the beauties of the language but the pure depth of spirit that actuated the writers. Although science does not strictly occupy a place in classical literature, yet it deserves a passing notice on account of the noted names connected with its advancement, some of which are Aristotle, famous as a philosopher, Hippocrates, the originator of medicine as a science, and many others of equal note. Among the later Greek historians, Polybius stands foremost. A beautiful extract is given from his description of Hannibal's crossing the Alps. From the great number of Greek writers who applied themselves to Roman history are selected as especially worthy of mention, Strabo, still holding high rank as a historian and geographer, Josephus,



who applied himself to Jewish history, Plutarch, whose biographies stand at present as models in this character of writing.

Part II., the Literature of Rome. Although we have come to a new division of our book, we do not find so much difference after all, for the Romans followed pretty much in the path the Greeks had marked out. The Greeks were noted for their creation, the Roman's for their imitation, and our author very well expresses it when he says, the history of Latin literature is simply the action of the Greek mind upon the Roman. The Romans were of too practical and war-like a spirit, and too little originality and enthusiasm, to ever reach a high position in literature. This division is treated according to the different ages—golden, silver, iron—containing histories of the writer's discussions of their style, and many characteristic extracts. Among other things, it has a pronouncing dictionary, some parts of which we think are subject to criticism.

The only criticism which might, perhaps, be justly made is that the author does not seem to be up with modern investigation upon some of the subjects which he treats.

S. B.

THE RELIGION OF ANCIENT EGYPT; or the Origin and Growth of Religion, as Illustrated by the Religion of Ancient Egypt, by P. Le Page Renouf. [The Hibbert Lectures for 1879.] New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 743 and 745 Broadway. 1880. Price \$1.50.

In this volume of 264 pages we have six excellent lectures: 1. The Sources of Information Respecting the Ancient Egyptian Religion. 2. Antiquity and Characteristics of Egyptian Civilization. 3. The Gods of Egypt. 4. Communion with the Unseen World. 5. The Religious Books of Egypt. 6. Religious Books and Hymns: Henotheism, Pantheism, and Materialism.

Our author seems to have visited Egypt and made extensive personal investigations in exploring the ruins of the ancient grandeur of that wonderful country. In presenting his researches and investigations, and deciphering the

Egyptian hieroglyphic writing, he gives to the common reader a clearer insight into the ancient condition and greatness and the religious characteristics and beliefs of Egypt, than any other writer of whose work we have any knowledge.

He insists that "there is not a single Egyptian monument known which in its bearings upon chronology is liable to the charge of numerical exaggeration." He admits, however, "the manifest defect for chronological purposes of such inscriptions is, that the last monumental year which happens to be preserved to us of a king is not necessarily the last of his reign. An error of several (perhaps many) years is possible in each reign where there is no direct evidence to the contrary. But," he says, "the error is at all events not on the side of exaggerated numbers."

He does not believe that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. He places him contemporary with the great Rameses.

He calculates the exodus of the Israelites to have taken place 1310 years before Christ, and estimates the beginning of the historical Egyptian monarchy 2050 years before the exodus. He dates the great pyramid at least 3000 years before Christ. He thinks, with Brugsch and others, that the seeming conflict between Egyptian and Bible chronology is in the fact that the Bible chronology is not understood. We might add just here, with propriety, that perhaps Egyptian chronology, if Egyptian hieroglyphics can be said to establish a chronology, is not understood. This, we think, our author admits.

He does not admit any relationship between the Egyptian language and any known language except its descendant, the Coptic. He separates it entirely from the Semitic and Indo-European languages. He denies any resemblance or kinship either in the roots or terminations.

The lecture on the architectural skill and beauty of the ancient Egyptian monuments, painting, music, and their moral sensibilities and principles, together with the description of their books, mythology, gods, government, etc., etc., is full of interest and valuable information.

While these lectures were not delivered or this book written, perhaps, in the interest of Bible truth, as we understand it, yet no violence to its teachings is intended.

We welcome this volume as a valuable accession to the rapidly increasing literature upon Egypt and its antiquities, and every effort pours some new light upon this ancient nation and their peculiar and difficult language, which tends to strengthen the faith of the world in the Word of God.

K.

**THE SAVIOUR'S CONVERTS:** What we Owe Them and How we may Aid Them, by the Rev. William Scribner, author of "Pray for the Holy Spirit," "These Little Ones," etc. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 743 and 745 Broadway. 1880. Price \$1.00.

This is a good little book of 174 pages, well printed on good paper and bound in cloth.

The special object of the author is to impress upon the Church its duty to converts, the young in Christian life, whether brought into its communion from the cold and wicked world or from the household of faith—the children of the covenant.

We all know that the young convert needs help and that the older Christian can, by a little thought and attention, give him great assistance. Satan understands their weakness and ignorance and is always ready to take advantage of it to discourage, confuse, deceive, and mislead them. Every Christian by his own experience knows this. If the church members would gather close around the new converts, and tell them of the difficulties in the way and show them how to avoid or meet them, we would have fewer inefficient and discouraged members, and the Church would be a greater power for good. The Church would not have so many blundering, unhappy members, and the world would feel more of its peaceful and holy influence. We do not expect our infant to grow and learn without our attention and direction. Nor should we leave the young Christian without assistance, but by the Holy Spirit lead and teach him.

It is mainly for this that our author has written this book, and he has certainly done it well. We wish it could be placed in the hands of all young Christians, and it would be well for all who wish to help the young to send and get it.

K.

A POPULAR COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT, by English and American Scholars of Various Evangelical Denominations, with Illustrations and Maps, Edited by Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D. Vol. I.—Matthew, Mark, and Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1880.

In the last number of the REVIEW we noticed the second volume of Dr. Schaff's "Popular Commentary on the New Testament." We now wish to call the attention of our readers to the first volume, Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

The contents of this volume are:

Introduction to the New Testament by Dr. Schaff and Prof. M. B. Riddle, D.D.

1. General Introduction: Name, origin, canon, character, organic arrangement, preservation of the text.

2. Special Introduction to the Gospels: Name and division, harmony and chronology, origin of the synoptic gospels, Gospel according to Matthew, according to Mark, according to Luke, according to John.

Commentary on Matthew by Dr. Schaff and Dr. Riddle. Commentary on Mark by Dr. Riddle and Dr. Schaff. Commentary on Luke by Dr. Riddle and Dr. Schaff.

There are eleven full-page engravings and seventy-one illustrations of the text. The engravings are very fine and all of the illustrations good. Their correctness is guaranteed by the announcement that they are edited by W. M. Thompson, D.D., and drawn from original photographs taken for him, or selected by him from illustrations in standard works. He is the author of the famous work, "The Land and the Book," which is so highly appreciated by Bible-scholars, and is equal to any, if not the very best authority among modern writers as to the history, geography, names, location of places, customs, and character of the Holy Land.

This volume contains six maps and plans, all good, by

Prof. A. Guyot, and two pages of *fac similes* of New Testament manuscripts, selected by Dr. Schaff and A. W. Tyler. In these *fac similes* is an illustration of the difference between the *uncial* and *cursive* modes of writing in the original Greek. On the two pages he gives examples of several *uncials* and three of the best *cursives*.

The discussions of the different topics under the head, "*Introduction*," are peculiarly interesting and valuable. We call special attention to the discussions on the "New Testament Canon," "The Character of the New Testament," "Organic Arrangement of the New Testament," "Preservation of the Text," and the "Different Versions." His "Harmony and Chronology" of the gospel is very fine, and also the synoptic gospels, and his introduction to each of the four gospels separately.

Rev. Prof. Humphrey, in his paper read before the Presbyterian Alliance at its council in Philadelphia, differs widely from our author upon the subject of inspiration. While Dr. Humphrey takes the position of plenary verbal or mechanical inspiration, held by Gausson and others, our author takes the more liberal position and makes inspiration concerned only with moral and religious truths and the communication of what is necessary to salvation. A position between the two may be nearer the truth.

The simple and direct manner of getting at the truth of the text characterises the whole work, so far as we have been able to examine it. The comments are plain, full, easy to be understood, and forcible. We are very much pleased with the whole plan and arrangement, and have no hesitation in recommending the work as the best commentary for general purposes that we have seen at all. It is an excellent work for Sunday-school teachers and for family use, as well as for the preacher.

It is published by the enterprising house of Charles Scribner's Sons, 743 and 745 Broadway, New York. Price, \$6.00 per volume.



TESTIMONY OF THE AGES: or Confirmations of the Scriptures, from Modern Science and Recent Discoveries, Ancient Records and Monuments, the Ruins of Cities and Relics of Tombs, the Greek and Latin Classics, Assyrian Inscriptions and Egyptian Hieroglyphics, Antique Sculptures, Coins, Gems, and Medals, the Ordnance Survey of Sinai, the Late Exploration of Palestine, the Literal Fulfilment of prophecies, as Attested by the Writings of Heathens, etc., etc.: Evidences which the *Plain Reader* can understand, which the *Scholar* will appreciate, and which the *Skeptic* cannot refute, by Hurbert W. Morris, D.D., author of "Science and the Bible," "Present Conflict of Science with the Christian Religion," etc. With Numerous Illustrations. Published by J. C. McCurdy & Co., Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, and St. Louis.

This is a day of book-making. The multiplication is wonderful, and they are of every grade and character. Large and small books, good books and bad, refined and unrefined, moral and immoral, for the scholar and for the masses, for the rich and for the poor. Many persons make books only for the money that may be realized from their sales; others that they may make a reputation and leave their names to the world; and others, which is the class that blesses the race, write that they may give to their fellow-man the benefit of their discoveries, their investigations, and their conclusions.

Those who write merely for money—may make money or not, but that is all they are likely to accomplish, except the evil they do by the bad influence of what they write. Those who write only for *name* are apt only to make a *name*, and that name may be evil. But those who write solely to benefit the race are public benefactors, and should receive the respect and gratitude of all good people.

Our author has given us a good book and its appearance is opportune. It is needed and will surely do good. While it is a book for the masses, and ought to be thoroughly distributed among the people, it is also a book for the student, and especially for the preacher.

The best testimony to the truth of the Bible which can be had from philosophy, science, and literature, of all the past, has been collected and presented in a convenient and

attractive manner. Most of the leading, and some of the most difficult, scriptures are taken up, beginning with the first of Genesis and running on through to Revelation, and strong testimony given to prove their truth. It is a fact, admitted by most scholars, that nothing testifies with more weight and stubbornness to the truth of the Bible than science in its modern discoveries and revelations, and these testimonies our author presents.

We take pleasure in recommending it to our readers as a valuable contribution to Christian literature.

It is sold by subscription and is an excellent book for the agent who wishes, while he may sell easily, to do good.

K.

**BRITISH THOUGHT AND THINKERS:** Introductory Studies, Critical, Biographical, and Philosophical. By George S. Morris, A.M., Lecturer on Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University, etc. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Price, \$1.75.

This is a volume of 388 pp., made up principally of lectures delivered by the author before his classes. The contents are as follows:

(1) Introductory.—General Philosophical Attitude of the English Mind. (2) Mediæval Anticipations of the Modern English Mind.—John of Salisbury, Roger Bacon, Duns Scotus, William of Occam. (3) Englishmen of the Renaissance.—Edmond Spencer, Sir John Davies, Richard Hooker. (4) William Shakespeare—Poet-Philosopher. (5) Francis Bacon. (6) Thomas Hobbes. (7) John Locke. (8) George Berkeley. (9) David Hume. (10) Sir William Hamilton. (11) John Stuart Mill. (12) Herbert Spencer.

As our author says in the preface: "It is introductory, rather than exhaustive—an invitation to reflective and systematic study, rather than a substitute for it. At the same time," he hopes, "by the expression of deliberate and reasoned opinions, to have pointed the way to correct views concerning the essential nature and value of the most conspicuous current of abstract thought in the English language. The large biographical element in more than half the chapters will not be unwelcome to those who realize that a thinker's

life is one of the indispensable keys to the due appreciation of his thought."

Prof. Morris has displayed good and scholarly judgment in his selection of thinkers and styles and types of thought, but we could wish that he had given a place to a few other thinkers and workers, even if he had been compelled to leave out one or two now in his list.

It is an interesting work of great scope, and deserves a place in the library of the student, especially of English literature.

K.

#### THE RELIGIONS OF CHINA.

Prof. James Legge, Chinese Language and Literature in the University of Oxford, has written a book upon the religions of China, in which he describes Confucianism and Tâoism, and compares them with Christianity.

On invitation Prof. Legge delivered four lectures in the Presbyterian College in London, in the spring of 1880, and these lectures are now given to the public in the book before us, by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. The first and second lectures are devoted to Confucianism, the third to Tâoism, and the fourth to the religions of China compared with Christianity.

More interest is being manifested, and much more known, about the Chinese religion and philosophy than formerly; and no doubt at no distant day the world will have a still better understanding of their mysterious philosophy and wonderful civilization.

Confucius, the great Chinese philosopher and law-giver, was, like Moses, not the originator, but the preserver, of the ancient religion of his country. As our author says: "It may be said that it took some tinge through him from his own character and views; but more than this cannot be affirmed. What he claimed for himself was to be a 'transmitter and not a maker, believing in and loving the ancients.'"

According to Prof. Legge, Confucius—that is, K'ung-foo-tsze, "the master K'ung,"—was born in the year 551 B. C., in Lu, one of the feudal states. His father, Liang-ko, an officer of remarkable strength, bravery, and skill, was over

seventy years old when Confucius was born. He was reared by his mother, who was poor, and consequently he had many struggles with poverty. He was married when he was nineteen, and his only son, Lî, was born the next year. He died when he was seventy-three years old—B. C., 478—having lived a long, eventful, remarkable, and very useful life. Among his last words were:

“The great mountain must crumble;  
The strong beam must break;  
And the wise man wither away like a plant.”

According to our author, the documents of the Shû, the most ancient, extend over between seventeen and eighteen centuries, and the Shîh, or book of poetry, from B. C. 1766 to 1123. Others extend on down into the sixth century B. C.

In the discussion of the Yî King, “the mysterious book,” he denies the position taken by other writers that the Yî is “the oldest book of the oldest nation,” or “the most ancient of the Chinese classical writings.” He makes it not more than the twelfth century B. C., and considers the Shû and the Shîh both much better authority for the ancient religion of China.

According to his statements, the religion of Confucius, if we may call it a religion rather than a philosophy, is monotheistic. He thinks the reason it has been considered polytheistic by some, is in the fact that the state has a different mode of worship from that allowed to the masses. The state worships—that is, offers prayers or sacrifices—directly to God, Tî; while the mass of the people sacrifice to God through the spirits of the departed. It seems to be a kind of saint worship. Our author gives translations of quite a number of solstitial prayers offered by the Ming dynasty in the year 1538, upon the occasion when the name of the Supreme Being, in the imperial worship, was changed from the “Shang Tî (dwelling in the), bright heavens,” to “Shang Tî (dwelling in the), sovereign heavens.” It is an interesting fact that while this change was being wrought in the imperial worship of China, in England, at the court of Henry VIII., they were arranging the articles of the new Creed, that turned the nation from the dogmas of the Romish Church.

We have space for but one of these prayers. After various offerings—such as feast- or food-offerings, thank-offerings accompanied with praise, drink-offerings, etc.,—the service was concluded with the following prayer: “We have worshipped and written the Great Name on this gem-like sheet. Now we display it before Tî, and place it in the fire. These valuable offerings of silks and fine meats we burn also, with these sincere prayers that they may ascend in volumes of flame up to the distant azure. All the ends of the earth look up to Him. All human beings, all things on the earth, rejoice together in the Great Name.”

He says: “The idea of substitution is not unknown in Chinese history, but has no place in the religious services.”

Much stress is laid on filial piety in their religious teaching, and our author thinks that this has done much “to turn the hearts of the children back to their fathers and to keep them attached to them and their ways;” and that the long continued existence and growth of the nation is a verification of the fifth commandment, “Honor thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee.”

Confucius, nearly six hundred years before, gave nearly exactly the same golden rule that our Saviour did. In fact, it is exactly the same according to Prof. Legge, except that Confucius gave the negative side, while the Saviour gave the positive. He says it is found “repeatedly in the Analects, the Doctrine of the Mean, and the Great Learning.” “Tsze-Kung once asked him (Confucius) if there was one word which would serve as a rule of conduct for all life; and he replied: ‘Is not reciprocity such a word?’—What you do not want done to yourself, do not do to others.”

In the third lecture he defines Tâoism and discusses its influence. He says that “it has two different applications: first, to a popular and widely spread religion of China; and then to the system of thought in the remarkable treatise called the Tâo Teh King, written in the sixth century B. C. by Lâo-teze. In other words, Tâoism is the name both of a religion and a philosophy.” So we find that Tâo is not the name of a person, but of an idea—a concept. According to



our author it had never assumed any system until after the introduction of Buddhism into China. Before, it had been only a mass of superstitions and sacrifices, without any definite shape.

There is a strange account of its founder, Láo-tsze—"the Old or Venerable Philosopher"—or literally translated, "Old Boy." He was so called because, they say, he was not born until his mother had carried him in her womb seventy-two, and some say, eighty-one years. It is said that his head was white with age when he was born. No one will wonder at that.

In his comparison of the three religions, Táoism, Confucianism, and Christianity, we have only room to say that the religions of China show themselves to be all human and full of mistakes, while Christianity proves itself to be more than human and one unbroken body of truth. It is refreshing to compare the Bible and the Christian system with the most enlightened and best systems of religion which have ever been produced by human minds. It always rises higher and higher in our estimation, and leads us with still greater reverence to lift up our hearts in adoration to its Great Author.

There is much more we would like to say in reference to this interesting book, but as much has been said as our space will allow. The style is pleasant and easy; it is printed on good paper, and well bound in good cloth; 308 pages; price, \$1.50. Send to Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

K.

**THE CHALDEAN ACCOUNT OF GENESIS:** From the Cuneiform Inscriptions, etc., etc. By George Smith, Formerly of the Department of Oriental Antiquities, British Museum, etc. A new Edition, thoroughly Revised and Corrected (with Additions by A. H. Sayce, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Oxford). With Illustrations. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, \$4.

The activity which is characteristic of the present day is evinced not less in archæology than in other departments of knowledge. The comparatively recent excavations of Schliemann at Troy and Mycenæ, of Di Cesnola in Cyprus, of

Smith, Loftus, and Rassam, at Kouyunjik, and of others in other fields, have given fresh impetus to the study of antiquities. Valuable results have attended their labors.

The book before us is one of unusual interest. It contains the description of the Creation, the Deluge, the tower of Babel, the destruction of Sodom, the times of the patriarchs and Nimrod, and several Babylonian fables and legends of the gods.

The similarity, and in some cases, the identity of the account with the Mosaic statements are worthy of remark. On the other hand there are total disagreements and divergences. This, however, is nothing more than would be expected.

That which is of more special importance is the *Izdubar* Epic. The texts from which the epic was translated were inscribed on clay tablets excavated at Kouyunjik, the modern site of ancient Nineveh. They are, perhaps, not older than the times of Assur-bani-pal, the Augustus of Chaldean literature, about B. C. 670. These are, however, transcripts from older tablets, reaching as far back as, Prof. Sayce thinks, 2000 years B. C., and probably further. There seems to have been a considerable number of still older lays or poems, out of which the so-called *Izdubar* Epic was formed. And as the legends they celebrated were traditions in the country before they were committed to writing and embodied in poems, they must be referred to a very remote period as their starting point. If this be true, it would indicate a Chaldean or Babylonian civilization earlier than that allowed by the generally accepted Biblical chronology. It may be a debatable question whether the *Izdubar* Epic was original with the ancient Babylonians, being handed down from father to son by tradition after the flood, or whether it was borrowed from their Semitic neighbors at a later day. In the latter case, the discrepancy between the Semitic and Babylonian accounts would be proportionate to the time intervening between the traditional introduction and the commitment to writing of the latter account. However this may be, the facts as they are interpreted are found in the texts, and the reasons for any particular theory are assigned with candor and fairness by

the author, and the intelligent reader can judge for himself of their sufficiency.

Owing to the fragmentary condition of the tablets, and the present facilities for deciphering them, many changes in translation and theory will doubtless have to be made as the excavations advance. Without being able in a short notice to mention even the prominent merits of the book, suffice it to say, that it is one of absorbing interest, not to the Biblical student only, but to the philologist and ethnologist as well.

M.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION: By George F. Seward, Late United States Minister to China. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

There is much involved in the question of Chinese immigration. It is important in its political, financial, social, moral, and religious aspects. It is a subject of interest, not only to California and other portions of the Pacific coast, but to the people of the United States in every section. It is a question that should engage the mind, not only of the statesman, but of the philosopher and philanthropist as well; and in dealing with it in all of its phases it should be remembered that there are questions of vast magnitude underlying the mere proposition of race and nationality. Prejudice nor sympathy should control in the settlement and final adjustment of the question.

The author of our book was well prepared for the work he has done. Having spent several years in China as United States minister, he knows, from observation, something of Chinese civilization and character, and his views, therefore, are entitled to respect, and what he says upon the subject will be heard attentively. He has in his book discussed the subject in "its social and economical aspects" in a very able and satisfactory manner; but has not touched it in its moral, and especially its religious aspect. This, it seems to us, is an important part of the great question. The Christian people of the United States, as Christians, should carefully consider whether God in his providence is not, in this wonderful immigration of Chinese to our country, opening the door still

wider to Christian effort for the propagation of the Christian religion and Christian civilization in that vast empire. Should not California Christians and philanthropists rejoice in the opportunities they thus have of bringing, if not rapidly, yet gradually, the teeming millions of that vast empire to the knowledge of the religion of Christ?

In the political aspect of the question, it should not be forgotten that the very foundation of our civilization forbids extreme measures upon this question. The statutes of the United States recognize "the right of expatriation as a natural and inherent right of all people, indispensable to the enjoyment of the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;" and according to the treaty with China in 1868, both powers "recognize the inherent and inalienable right of man to change his home and allegiance, and also the mutual advantage of migration and emigration of their citizens and subjects respectively."

Our author argues that the immigration should not be prohibited, but that restrictions should be thrown around it to prevent convicts and degraded women being landed upon our shores. This, he thinks, can be done.

Many points and facts of interest are developed by our author, which make his book a valuable contribution to the discussion of this subject, and we recommend it to all who feel an interest in the question.

K.







## SCHOOLS.

### Cumberland University. Waynesburg College,

WAYNESBURG, PA.

This Institution is complete in all its departments. It has a thorough Preparatory School, with five instructors; a Collegiate Department, with four professors; a Theological School, with five professors and instructors; a Law School, with three professors.

#### EXPENSES:

Preparatory School.....	\$20.00
Freshman and Sophomore Classes, each.....	20.00
Junior and Senior Classes, each.....	25.00
Law School.....	50.00
Contingent Fee.....	5.00
Boarding per week, in families.....	3.50
In clubs.....	\$1.25 to 2.00

Candidates for the ministry are received free of charge.

Students in the Theological School are charged a matriculation fee of \$5.00, in addition to the contingent fee.

For Catalogues, or further information, address,

**N. GREEN, Chancellor.**  
LEBANON, TENN.

### LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, LINCOLN, ILLINOIS.

This Institution is carrying into effect, under proper restrictions, the co-education of young ladies and gentlemen, and is believed to be equal to the best colleges and seminaries in the land.

Besides the regular Preparatory and Collegiate Departments, it affords ample facilities for instruction in Painting, Penmanship, Modern Languages, and Elocution; and has connected with it a Conservatory of Music, in which all branches of this science are taught. Students completing the course prescribed in the Conservatory will receive diplomas.

#### GOOD BOARDING

can be obtained in private families from \$1.00 to \$3.50 per week, and in clubs from \$2.00 to \$2.55.

For catalogues, or any particulars, address,

**A. J. McGLUMPHY, D.D., President,**  
61 LOGAN ST.

### BOTH SEXES ADMITTED.

A LIVE INSTITUTION,

UNSURPASSED IN

Healthfulness of Location,

Thoroughness of Instruction,

Economy of Expense,

and Moral Tone,

affording the most desirable facilities for acquiring a thorough

**ENGLISH AND CLASSICAL EDUCATION,  
AT THE LEAST POSSIBLE EXPENSE.**

Winter term begins January — 1881.

Spring term begins March — 1881.

Fall term begins September — 1881.

For fuller information address,

**A. B. MILLER, D.D., President.**

### TRINITY UNIVERSITY.

Rev. W. E. BEESON, D.D., President.

*A Full Corps of First-Class Teachers.*

Classical, Scientific, and Commercial Courses.

**MUSIC AND MODERN LANGUAGES**

BY THE BEST TEACHERS.

**THE INSTITUTION IS FOR BOTH  
MALE AND FEMALE.**

**CHARGES MODERATE.**

Teahuacana is one of the healthiest locations in Texas.

For particulars address the President,

**TEHUACANA,  
Limestone Co., Texas.**

### THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY.

#### — FACULTY. —

**N. GREEN, LL.D., Chancellor**

**S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology.**

**R. V. FOSTER, Professor of Hebrew and New Testament Greek.**

**J. D. KIRKPATRICK, Professor of Ecclesiastical History.**

**Professor of Biblical Literature.**

LECTURES delivered during the winter months: On Pastoral Work by A. J. Burd, D.D.; on Mission Work, by J. K. Brown, D.D.

MINISTERS and others who feel an interest in the circulation of the REVIEW are earnestly solicited to act as agents.

No subscription will be taken for a less time than one year, and the back numbers of the volume will, in all cases, be sent whenever it is practicable to do so. Price per single copy, *in advance*, Two Dollars per annum. An extra copy to any one sending a club of seven.

Subscribers changing their post-office address are requested to give notice to the Publisher.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for all the views of their correspondents. No writer, however, will be permitted to express sentiments subversive of any of the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures. Free discussion will be tolerated in the pages of the REVIEW, provided a dignified and Christian spirit is maintained.

Money should be sent by Check, Post-office Order, Draft, or Express. Otherwise, the remittance will be at the sender's risk.

All matter for publication, and all matters of business connected with the REVIEW, should be sent to

J. D. KIRKPATRICK,

LEBANON, TENN.